

The *VINDICATION* of
Liturgies,
Lately Published by Dr. *FALKNER*,
PROVED
NO *VINDICATION*
OF THE

Lawfulness, Usefulness and Antiquity of SET-FORMS of Publick Ministerial Prayer, to be Generally used by, or Imposed on all Ministers; And consequently

An Answer to a Book, Intituled, A Reasonable Account why some Pious Nonconformists judge it sinful, for them to perform their Ministerial Acts in by the Prescribed Forms of others.

Wherein with an Answer to what Dr. *Falkner* hath said in the Book aforesaid, the *Original Principles* are discovered; from whence the different apprehensions of men in this Point arise.

By the Author of the *Reasonable Account*,
and *Supplement* to it.

Prov. 18. 7. *He that is first in his own cause, seemeth just; but his neighbour cometh, and searcheth him.*

LONDON, Printed for Benjamin Alsop, at the
Angel and Bible in the Poultry. 1681.

LIBRARY

OF THE
MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY
AND
ZOOLOGICAL GARDEN



Presented by
the Hon. the Secretary of the
Museum of Natural History
and
Zoological Garden

Received of the Hon. the Secretary of the
Museum of Natural History
and
Zoological Garden

the sum of
£
for
the purchase of
the
book
of
the
Museum of Natural History
and
Zoological Garden

To those Honourable
Knights, Citizens & Burgesſes,
Who Are, or Shall be Chosen,
To Represent the
Commons of England,
In the Next Affembly of
PARLIAMENT.

1. **B**Efore you (moſt Renowned Patriots) we moſt humbly ſpread our
Cause (to whom ſhould the Commons
of England make their Applications, but
to thoſe whom they have choſen, to repre-
ſent them in their Circumſtances of Diſtreſs
and Grief? Eſpecially when their moſt
Gracious Sovereign, hath ſo often de-
clared, the Benignity of his Royal Nature
to them, and readineſs to joyn in any Act
or Acts declarative or confirmative of it;
and when the moſt Noble Lords in the
years 1672 and 1673; together with
the Commons, (then aſſembled) had gone
ſo far as to our Relief in the Cauſe, as
they did, notwithstanding which the mu-
tability

A 2

The Epistle Dedicatory.

ability of your Honourable House seems to require a new Application to your Honours. How far we have applied our selves to the Reverend Bishops, will appear to your Honours by the Account of the Proceedings of the Commissioners of both Perswasions, appointed by his Sacred Majesty, &c. Printed 1661; and several other overtures. That the case was the same then that is by us now pleaded for, will appear to your Honours by that Printed Account, p. 5. in their 7 Proposal expressed in these words:

*“ That the Gift of Prayer, being one
“ special Qualification for the work of
“ the Ministry bestowed by Christ, in
“ order to the Edification of his Church,
“ to be exercised for the profit and
“ and benefit thereof, according to its
“ various and Emergent necessities; It
“ is desired that there may be no such Im-
“ position of the Liturgy as that the
“ exercise of that Gift be thereby totally
“ excluded, in any part of Publick
“ Worship. And that the Commis-
sioners on the other side so apprehended, ap-
pears by their Answer then to this Proposal
p. 35. where they replied, This makes the
Liturgy void, which is very true as to
Usi-*

The Epistle Dedicatory.

Universal use, and Imposition, but not otherwise.

2. *Nor is this Opinion, a Novel Opinion, or the liberty desired, a Novel Request : It appears by the Book called The Troubles of Frankford, that it is older than our Reformation by Q. Elizabeth, and coævous in England with the first hours of Reformation ; much older, in the Churches of Suinterland (the oldest Reformed Protestant Churches.) The Opinion and Practice of the Waldenses and Bohemians (whose Churches I do not call Reformed, but look upon them as continuing in their Integrity and succeeding in the Primitive Doctrine and Practice of the Church in a great measure, whilst other parts of the World were in their Apostacy for more than a thousand years together) None ever shewed us any Liturgy of Prayers they had, nor do they mention any in their accounts which by their Deputies they gave both of their Faith and Practice to Luther an Oecolampadius, which are extant in Scultetus's Annales Evang. That the practice we desire is the same with that in Scotland, New England, Holland is not to be denied.*

3. *The persons (most Renowned Patriots,*

The Epistle Dedicatory.

triot's, on whose behalf we desire it, are neither few nor inconsiderable. Two thousand Ministers were turned out 1662. Some are dead, but possibly, not a much lesser number are sprang up either in the Ministry, or Candidates for it: Of those let men say what they please, there will not be found a tenth part, that can think it lawful to perform their Ministerial Acts in Publick Solemn Prayer by the Prescribed Forms of other Men. And Dr. Falkner in his Epistle tells the World, That the Genius of that party is much set-against them, and in their Practice, they reject them almost generally with some eagerness; which is very true, and so appeareth, in that the far greater part of them can neither (upon eighteen years Trial) be perswaded that it is lawful for them to hear them, nor yet by any sort of Cudgells be Cudgelled into such a Belief or Practice, tho I must profess my self of another mind, and in that am my self a Dissenter from I believe 9 parts of ten of our Dissenters, whom yet I love and honour (I take in both Ministers and People unto my Account.) Nor are they Inconsiderable, considered, as to their Intellectuals or Morals, or Quality in the World, or
useful-

The Epistle Dedicatory.

usefulness to our English world; which must be owned, and will readily be (I am sure) by your Honours, who are the Eyes of the Nation, seeing in every corner of it, and being able better to judge of Numbers and Qualities of Persons, than we, that sit in our Studies, or any that take an Account from Registers, &c.

4. Nor are they invaluable, or the worst sort of men for Morality, and which is much higher True Piety and Godliness. Of late years your Honours have had many of them brought before you in your publick Sessions, and Assizes. Might not you say to those that brought them, as the Town Clerk of Ephesus once said, Acts 19. 37. You have brought hither these men, that are no Robbers of Churches, nor Blasphemers of God. I may add further, no Murtherers, no Adulterers, no Drunkards, no Profane, or false Swearers, no Perjured Persons, no Robbers by the High way, onely accused of Questions about a Law, not profitable to men, nor necessary for the glory of God. A Law which is but the Will of King and Parliament, whose Will hath been since sufficiently declared (tho not yet in that formality) that it should not be so rigorously pursued, nor ever was, that it should be exd

The Epistle Dedicatory.

triot's, on whose behalf we desire it, are neither few nor inconsiderable. Two thousand Ministers were turned out 1662. Some are dead, but possibly, not a much lesser number are sprang up either in the Ministry, or Candidates for it: Of those let men say what they please, there will not be found a tenth part, that can think it lawful to perform their Ministerial Acts in Publick Solemn Prayer by the Prescribed Forms of other Men. And Dr. Falkner in his Epistle tells the World, That the Genius of that party is much set against them, and in their Practice, they reject them almost generally with some eagerness; which is very true, and so appeareth, in that the far greater part of them can neither (upon eighteen years Trial) be persuaded that it is lawful for them to hear them, nor yet by any sort of Cudgells be Cudgelled into such a Belief or Practice, tho I must profess my self of another mind, and in that am my self a Dissenter from I believe 9 parts of ten of our Dissenters, whom yet I love and honour (I take in both Ministers and People unto my Account.) Nor are they Inconsiderable, considered, as to their Intellectuals or Morals, or Quality in the World, or useful-

The Epistle Dedicatory.

usefulness to our English world; which must be owned, and will readily be (I am sure) by your Honours, who are the Eyes of the Nation, seeing in every corner of it, and being able better to judge of Numbers and Qualities of Persons, than we, that sit in our Studies, or any that take an Account from Registers, &c.

4. Nor are they invaluable, or the worst sort of men for Morality, and which is much higher True Piety and Godliness. Of late years your Honours have had many of them brought before you in your publick Sessions, and Assizes. Might not you say to those that brought them, as the Town Clerk of Ephesus once said, Acts 19. 37. You have brought hither these men, that are no Robbers of Churches, nor Blasphemers of God. I may add further, no Murtherers, no Adulterers, no Drunkards, no Profane, or false Swearers, no Perjured Persons, no Robbers by the High way, onely accused of Questions about a Law, not profitable to men, nor necessary for the glory of God. A Law which is but the Will of King and Parliament, whose Will hath been since sufficiently declared (tho not yet in that formality) that it should not be so rigorously pursued, nor ever was, that it should be exd

The Epistle Dedicatory.

ecuted in that manner and with those circumstances that it hath been. For their Religion, let it be judged from what your Honours have observed, in their behaviour both in Religious Duties, and as to their Civil converse with men. For their Religious Conversation, let it be observed, Whether the generality of them, when they are in Gods Publick Worship, are they, who when they should be joyning with the Minister in putting up Prayers (whether he be praying by Forms or no) have their Eyes up and down, here and there; are whispering and talking to those that are next them, it may be sleeping; or rather be not those who (natural infirmities allowing it) do stand up or kneel, keep their Eyes shut, or fixed upon God, and (so far as man can judge) mind what they are about, with all Indication of Reverence and Godly fear? Whether they be the Persons that talk, or sleep out Sermons, or that hear the word of God (so far as men can judge) with trembling? Not that none but they do so, my concern is not to discourse of others, but for them. Whether they generally be not a People against all Idols and Idolatry, that dread to use the name of God idly, or to swear by it or by any Creatures Prophane-ly?

The Epistle-Dedicatory.

ly? Whether they be those that prophane the Sabbath, by unnecessary Journyings, or Labours, or Recreation, and do not ordinarily spend it in the publick and private Duties of Gods Worship? For their behaviour towards men, Are they generally the Sons and Daughters of this age, that dare curse their Fathers and Mothers, and reprecach the Womb that bare them? Are they Murtherers, Thieves, Adulterers, Fornicators, Perjured Persons? Do they not generally make Conscience to Owe nothing to any, but to love one another, to deal justly with men? I will not speak for every Individual (Christ had a Judas in his Flock.) Nor do I reflect on any others; I know there are many that are no Dissenters, who are Pious towards God, Righteous towards Men. I would only have these on both sides made one. What have their worst Enemies to Object, but disobedience to an Humane Law in matter of Divine Worship, wherein they do in all sincerity profess they cannot do, or omit the thing commanded or, forbidden without sinning against God. In the mean time your Honours see their bitterest Enemies can disobey Laws against Pluralities and Non-residents. Others of them can disobey Laws
against

The Epistle Dedicatory.

*against Drunkenness, Swearing, Cursing
Adulteries, &c. and not see the beams
in their own eyes, tho they cannot but say
these Laws, are against things plainly,
and syllabically forbidden in the Word of
God. And indeed none lives on either side
but violates some Humane Laws. Ne-
mo sine crimine vivit. Optimus ille qui
minimis urgetur, said an Heathen Poet,
and truly without doubt.*

5. Nor (most Honoured Patriots!)
*are the Arguments of those who are charged
as disobedient (as to this very point of
Prayer) invaluable, nor can any mans
confidences make them appear so to your
Reasonable and Generous Souls. It is not
so evident as some Infallibles of our age
would make it, That the Holy Spirit of
God, hath not or may not have a special
and immediate influence upon Pious Mi-
nisters Souls, as to their words in Prayer,
as well as upon Gods Peoples words in
Confession, or Ministers words in Preach-
ing (both which the Scripture asserts)
which ought not to be excluded in that
Prayer where words are to be used. Nor is
it certain that words are not an Essential
Part of all Ministerial Prayer, and these
or these words an Essential part of this*
or

The Epistle Dedicatory.

or that Prayer: Nor that any Superior can direct an Essential Part of Gods Worship: nor that in an Act of Worship, where God hath left any thing to Ministers or Peoples Liberty, that they may do this or that, any Superiors can determine them to one part against the other: Nor many things more in the following sheets, which are enlarged upon. Some parts of some of these Questions may appear clear to some, the other part to others. But this will conclude the things in themselves not to be plainly and clearly lawful: Your Honours abhor an Infallible Judge boasted of by the Papists, let it not be pretended to in the Tems of Protestants. Nor one Infallible person suffered to triumph over others, in the near concerns of Divine Worship. In things necessary for all by a Divine Law, we humbly allow it the Kings and your Honours duty to command us: But if they appear not such upon plain evidence to our Superiors, we beseech their Pardon, if we say, They cannot with any security to themselves from the Divine Law, enjoyn them to, or inforce them from those who judge them sinful in Divine Worship.

6. And as it is not possible, that any Divine Rule should be produced to make
such

The Epistle Dedicatory.

Such a thing as this necessary to be brought into, or continued in Publick Worship: So these two last years have given abundant Evidence that it is not Expedient to tie all men to the use of them. We are sure your Honours will grant, from the Instances of the Songs of Thanksgiving Recorded in Scripture, both those of Moses and Miriam and Deborah, and David, and from the Prayers in Scripture, of Solomon, David, Jehosaphat, Hezekiah, Ezra, &c. That when Persons are under Signal Providences, whether of Deliverances or Distress, or in respect of some general Sin, the Servants of God, have not thought it sufficient in Publick Prayer, To give thanks in general words for all Mercies and Preservations, but to tell him of his particular wondrous works; to recognize him, the Author of this, or that Salvation: To confess and bewail those particular Sins, if they be the Sins of the generality of the People: To put up Petitions suited to those particular distresses the Church or State is in. This is plain in all Scripture: And where it is not done, God is eminently restrained in his Glory; our duty is eminently neglected: We are sure God within these two years hath made
Eng-

The Epistle Dedicatory.

England as remarkable a Stage of Providence as ever any Nation in the World was made. We have been in most eminent distresses, and have had most eminent deliverances: Both of them concerning the whole Nation, and all that in the Nation can be dear to every good man. The life of our Sovereign, the life of our Religion, The life of our Ancient Government, The lives of several of our Noblemen, multitudes of our Gentry, and many thousands of our Commonalty: Plots upon Plots have been discovered, --- Uno Succiso Pullulat alter. We have had to deal with an Hydra. Now we humbly refer it to your Honours to judge, what particular Homage, either of Prayer or Praise, God hath had, relating to these distresses in all our particular Congregations: And whether the limiting all Ministers to Old Forms of Prayer, hath not been the cause of this High Omission? The Practice of our Ministers satisfied as to Confirmity is two-fold. Some take themselves obliged, not only (as all are) in the Desk to add nothing to the Forms. But in their Pulpits to keep to the Bidding of Prayer in the Canon; or at least to Preface their Sermons with half a dozen lines taken out of
some

The Epistle Dedicatory.

Some Collect, and conclude them with either Gloria patri, &c. or that excellent Collect our Vindicator tells us of, Grant we beseech Almighty God, &c. those (and these are not a few) could never put up one Prayer (except upon 11 April 1679, for which were indeed good and particular Forms made) for any deliverance, nor yet offer up one Publick Thanksgiving. Others there are, who conceive that though the Statute gives them in the letter of it, no further liberty, yet the continual Practice of our Church, not control'd by any Law, hath otherwise expounded the Statute. I doubt not but in many of their Congregations, Prayer and Praise, as to these Providences, hath not been restrained from the Almighty. But your Honours know what is truth in the Affair, more than any private Person can; and who knows not, that the particular Emergencies, respecting several Congregations, and the Members of them, are such, as had need of Forms to be made every week, to have them comprehensive of all just matter, of Prayer and Praise for that Congregation.

7. Nor finally, are the Sufferings of Multitudes, both of Ministers and People things invaluable, not to look back further,

The Epistle Dedicatory.

ther, than the manifestation of His *Majesties* and the *Parliaments* good will, for *Dissenters liberty*, Anno 1672, and 1673. (though it was not formally perfected by an Act.) It would fill a Volume to tell your *Honours*, how many and how great the *Sufferings* of good men have been since that time; all have been bottomed in this, (or at least most of them) that the most of the Sufferers have not thought it lawful, *either to perform their Ministerial Acts in Prayer, by the prescribed Forms of others, or to hear such a Ministration*; and therefore *Ministers*, who thought themselves obliged to Preach, have been constrained to do it in *private*, and *People*, who could not satisfy themselves without *hearing* somewhere, have been *inforced to bear in Private Meetings*. Hence both *Ministers* and *People*, have been most woefully pursued in *Ecclesiastical Courts*, at *Affizes*, and *Sessions*; some, to the loss of *two Thirds of their Estates*; some, to *Imprisonment* for six Years together; some one way, and to one degree; others in another way, to another degree. Some more *legally* in *Courts*, where some have been found to defend a righteous Cause: Others more *illegally*, they have had doors broken

The Epistle Dedicatory.

broken open, their Goods taken away to great Values, when some (Ministers) have been 20 Miles off at that time, when they were sworn to preach at Meetings. Others (private Persons) at great distances from home, or sick in their Beds, yet have not been able to remedy themselves. But it were infinite to run into Particulars, we doubt not but your *Honours* have seen and heard enough, as if some men had designed to leave none to whom the *King* and *Parliament* should shew any mercy. All this while the *Papists* (scarce one of whose Names we heard of in any Courts) were hatching their most Hellish Designs against the Life of the *King*, our *Religion* and *Government*; since which time their Designs have broken out, and been made manifest to our *English World*: and certainly the madness of some *Protestants* (to speak no worse) and their apparent inclinations to more *charity* for *Papists*, than *Protestants* (whose very Name some of these men do not like; *Catholics*, they say, pleaseth them better: it is easie to be judged they do but keep the *Envy* within their teeth for a while) layeth an high obligation on all true *Englishmen* to unite all *Protestants*, that we be not made a *common Prey*.

The Epistle Dedicatory.

8. Yet did we ask of your *Honours* to take away all *Liturgies*, our desire might be more liable to Exception, (why should we prescribe to others *Consciences*?) Nor did they in 1641. it was the Act of a Parliament, in which not the Tenth part were either *Presbyterians* or *Independents*. They only desire the leaving it at liberty, as in most, if not in all other Reformed Churches. Nor are they ambitious of *Bishopricks*, *Deanaries*, *Prebendaries*; they can truly say, *Nolumus Episcopari*, let the King give these things to whom he pleaseth. Let us but have *Bread*, and a liberty to *Preach the Gospel* without the wounding of our *Consciences*.

9. Now may the Great God of Peace, grant an happy understanding betwixt His most Excellent Majesty and Your Honours. May the King live, and live for ever, and the Parliament be as a sheaf of Arrows in His Hand, to strike through the loins of all those who have ill-will to Him, to the Reformed Religion, or Ancient Government of
a this

The Epistle Dedicatory.

this Nation. And may Your *Honours*
have the glory of *causing your Banished*
to return, and being called, *The Re-*
pairers of our Breaches, *The Restorers*
of our waste places to be inhabited, So
shall all *Posterity* call you blessed,

And your *Petitioners*

ever humbly pray, &c.

AN

AN
INTRODUCTION
TO THE
ENSUING DISCOURSE,

Offered to every
Intelligent and Pious Reader.

Good Reader,

I. **T**Hou hast found me so unhand-
somerly Represented in a Book of Dr.
Falkners, which he calleth, *A Vindication*
of Liturgies: To which I have here re-
turned an Answer, that I cannot but judge
it reasonable, that I should introduce thee
into my following Discourse, with a
Character of my self. I had my time of
Childhood and *Vanity* as well as others,
and, perhaps, did my self once think,
that there was no such Service of God as
by *Forms of Prayer*. But since I began
to write *Man*, since I understood any
thing

An INTRODUCTION

thing of *Communion with God*, since I entred into the *Ministry*, (which is now *Thirty four Years*) I have seen what I judged reason to be, of another *mind*. My whole *Ministry* hath been ordinarily exercised in one and the same place, where my *Conversation* hath been exposed to a sufficient view. As the time of my appearing to the World will clear me from having *Concerns* in the late Wars, from having any thing to do in pressing the *Covenant*, or the *Ejecting*, *Silencing* and *Imprisoning* Men for the refusal of it. So it is enough to tell you, that I never came near an Army, nor ever saw the face of *Oliver* Lord Protector, nor ever had the least *Preferment* from him, or *Concernment* with him. I was always a man of a very open and free *Converse*, and have had the honour of an *Acquaintance* and *Converse* with the most *Learned* men of the *Episcopal*, *Presbyterian*, or *Conregational* *Persuasions*, in the place where I lived, and elsewhere in some degrees. *Tros Tyriusque mihi, &c.* Where I saw *Learning* and *Sobriety*, I never made a difference, thinking, That the Kingdom of God lay not in these things. I have had many opportunities, as to men of an
Epis-

Episcopal Judgment, to do them *signal Kindnesses* or *Injuries*; of the former I did many, of the latter none, to any one Learned and Sober Man. I always thought *England* was short enough of them for its Ministerial Uses, so as we should not make a particular *Persuasion* an occasion to render them useless. In the late Times I constantly pleaded the cause of any Minister in question, if he were question'd only for using the *Common Prayer*, not for any *fundamental Error*, nor for any *Debauchery* in his Life. I must confess I always thought a *Sottish Minister* was the vilest of men, and never had an heart to plead one of their Causes, though I think there is not one of them can say I did them further injury, than by leaving them to plead for themselves. This freedom of *Converse* I kept till His *Majesties Restoration*, and several Years after, until I saw that some (as I judged at least) humned my Company, and I never yet wanted enough so far as to tempt me to be an *Intruder* upon any. How little I was concerned in any Publick Affairs will appear from this, That (if I remember right) from 1646, when I entred the Ministry, till 1653, I never but once

AN INTRODUCTION

saw *London*, nor I think twice more betwixt that and 1659. I much kept home, and could hardly be a month from my People, but my Conscience was ready to ask me, in the words of *Eliab*, *With whom hast thou left those few sheep in thy trust?*

II. Upon the coming out of the *Act of Uniformity*, I was concerned (with Two thousand Ministers more) to examine whether no more were by it required of me, than I might without *swearing against God* do? I saw so many things made necessary to the keeping of my station, that I suspected what I found, and more too, *viz.* That it was by some contrived to throw out of the Publick Ministry a sort of men, and all of them who were possessed of my Principles in *Doctrine*; and though it would not do as to all, yet it did as to a very great part, even all those who though they believed the same things with many that did conform in points of *Doctrine*, yet had some stricter Notions as to *Worship*. I was afterwards the more confirmed in this, from a Reverend Minister, (now I doubt not but with God, who lived and dyed a Conformist) who told me, that in dis-

course

to the Ensuing Discourse, &c.

course with a Brother of his, a Member in that *Parliament*, and lamenting to him the Turning out of so many Ministers; and putting so many terms upon Ministers, as they could not but know would Turn out the greater part of Ministers so and so principled as to *Doctrine*, &c. He told him, *It was their design to do it.* It is very like he did not speak the Sense of the *House of Commons*, of which he was a Member, but of many he doubtless did; That for those of *Puritan Principles*, (as they call'd them) *Jehu* might slay such as escaped the Sword of *Hazael*, and *Elisha* those that did escape the Sword of *Jehu*. But when I came more narrowly to look into the Things required, I discoursed with Divines (and those who were most Learned) of the *Episcopal Persuasion*, I offered my Arguments, heard their Answers; I read the generality of Books wrote on all sides, but upon the whole judged, that of eight or nine things required, I could not judge three, or not above three, in any degree lawful. I resolved to lay down my Publick Ministry; but being set apart to the Ministry, having solemnly promised not to take away my hand from that Plough, I could

AN INTRODUCTION

not then think my self discharged from it further than in *Publick Temples*, (places in Superiors disposal.) Amongst other things, I was then fully posselt of the *Unlawfulness of performing Ministerial Acts in Prayer, by the prescribed Forms of others*. Three or four of those Arguments, truly I think I may say all but one of them, were my Arguments 1662. and then freely discoursed with divers of my own Brethren, and several Learned men (some of whom are dead, some yet alive) at this time, and the Heads of them by me were drawn up in writing, and the most considerable Inlargements, as to the proof of them. From that time, till 1673, they lay by me; some little before that, all knew at what a rude rate all *Nonconformists* were treated in several Books, as the veriest *Dunces* in the world, men that opposed themselves to *Authority* meerly out of *Stubbornness*, judging the things *lawful*, being able to give no Reasons for their *Nonconformity*, Men fit for *Gallies, Prisons, &c.* This made me review what I had Eleven Years before drawn up for my own private use, with some Additions, and particularly Answers to some Arguments which in that time I had

to the Ensuing Discourse, &c.

had met with, and Dr. *Falkner's* Book coming at that time out, I could not baulk what he had said. Whosoever readeth what I wrote, will be my Compurgator, that I did not give any a Presumption, that I thought my Cause weak, by any uncivil treating of the Doctor. I saw he was a man of some Learning, that he had read many Authors; nor had I ever heard an ill word of him as to Sobriety of Life, or *Warping in Doctrine*. I treated him with that *Civility* which I thought became me, meerly answering his pretended Reason and Arguments. I did indeed see, that the making good the *Notion* I was fully possess'd of, would make any further answer to his *Libertas Ecclesiastica* needless, and am very much for the Rule of *Frustra fit per plura, &c.*

III. But though I quickly concluded this *sinful to me*, to perform my *Ministerial Acts in Prayer, by the prescribed Forms of others*, yet I never intended to trouble others with my *Notion*, till I was challenged to it, by the worlds being told, *We had nothing to say for our selves*. I never that I remember preached it in one Sermon, I never affirmed it *sinful for People*

AN INTRODUCTION

People to join with others that use Forms, (though, by the way, I do not think that People in the worship of God may lawfully do whatsoever they judge *just lawful*, if they be commanded to do it) I was a little tender my self as to *Total Separation*. This hath made me from the Year 1662, not decline hearing Ministers that used it, nor (as occasion offer'd) receiving the Sacrament with *sober Ministers*, and a *sober People*, though the Minister used the *Liturgy* in doing of it, although withal neither have I refused to hear others, and receive it with them too as I had occasion; nor, I think, shall I be deter'd from it, by the Scare-crow-word *Separation*. I fear not separating from any, with whom I am but morally persuaded by Arguments which I cannot answer, that I cannot join, without *separating from the Will of God*, and further I will *separate* from no Christians in the world. This, Reader, is known, to as many as know me by any ocular observation of my Converse.

IV. Further than this, my Nature disposeth me to such a Benignity, as I am *Enemy* to none but such as are open *Enemies*

to the Ensuing Discourse, &c.

miss to the Glory of God, or led by their Lusts and Passions to Acts disturbing Humane Societies. Upon the first account, I always thought *Atheists*, open *Blasphemers*, professed publick *Idolaters*, were to be punished by the Judge with the severest punishments. *Profane Swearers* and *Carfers*, and *Violation of the Sabbath*, with proportionable punishments; and those who detected such, did a good action. Yet as to these, I never thought an *Inquisition* might be set up, nor an Oath *Ex Officio*, administered, to make them to accuse themselves. Nor as to *Idolatry*, did I ever think that the Magistrate ought to punish any thing but *Open Profession* of it, or *Seduction* to it. Upon which account, until this late *Plot* convinced me, that nothing would serve the *Papists* less than the whole Government; and that to get it, they thought *Assassinations*, *Poysoning*, *Lying*, *For swearing*, any thing lawful, I never heard of a *Papist* punished, whom I did not pity. For the latter, I discerned God so great a Lover of *Humane Society*, that all the *Precepts* of the *Second Table* are apparently calculated for the *preservation* of it, as I could not but abhor those who without a just

and

AN INTRODUCTION

and apparent cause, made any attempt upon the quiet of it. Upon this account, I never was a Companion of any of these, but in my heart abhorred them: But for *Errors*, which had nothing of these in them, I could always give an allowance to them, always judging that I was not *Infallible*; and there was the same distance from my Neighbor to me, as from me to him. Though I always thought, that a particular Church might, as to its own Communion, judge of such persons, yet I never thought the Magistrate concern'd to *burn Houses*, imprison any, because some *Church-men* made an Outcry against them as *Hereticks*, *Schismatics*; or that an whole City must be put into Arms, (as in *Madrid* and *Lisbon*) because there is a Cry made for the *Holy House*. And amongst all the Enemies of *Humane Society*, and indeed *Mankind*, I always thought some of the worst, and least able to give account of their actions either to *God* or *Men*, who pursue others to any *signal Suffering*, because they differed from them in some Opinions, which could neither be accused with *Blasphemy*, *Atheism*, *Idolatry*, or any apparent *prophanation of the*
Name

to the *Ensuing Discourse*, &c.

Name of God, or apparent disturbance of the *Peace* and *Civil Government* under which they lived.

V. These being my Principles, this my steady practice; (Reader) one would have thought I might have passed the few remaining days of my Pilgrimage, without the strife, or dirt of Tongues, or without (at least) any considerable Suffering; but it hath not been my lot: yea, possibly, I have met with more than others who have been in greater *opposition* to some *Gentlemen* of the present Age, which puts me in mind of what a great *Church-man*, not long since, said to a *Reverend* and very worthy Friend of mine, (rather of further latitude than my self, and pleading it to him against a most unreasonable molestation) *I know you can and do go far, we must make you go further*; or words to that sense: which is a little *temptation* to me, to suspect I have gone too far: And brings to my mind, what an *Eminent Person* (since dead) said to me almost Thirty Years since, (being a Young man at that time, and advising with him about a *compliance* in some things

AN INTRODUCTION

things with those who then Ruled, desiring to strengthen my self with his Reasons, he would give me but two :

First, *I know* (saith he) *they will fall, and I will not willingly fall with them.*

Secondly, *I am* (saith he) *resolved not to go two Miles with them, and therefore I will not go one.* This latter is applicable in our Case, I see those who go one Mile, must voluntarily go another, or be cudgelled. But, I thank God, I have moved on better Principles, and such as I hope, will relieve me, though I be cudgelled for not going further.

VI. But though I had not met with the kindness I expected from others, yet one would have thought I might have expected it from Dr. *Falkner*, (a person whom I never saw, and of whom, when I wrote that Book, I never had had any but *Reverend* and worthy thoughts) to whom, in that *Discourse*, and the *Supplement* to it, I had not given the least unworthy or *diminutive word*; but whether I have met with it or no, Reader be thou Judge. He takes all imaginable advantages (and mostly without any just cause) to make me to appear a *Dunce* as to *Chronology*,

to the Ensuing Discourse, &c.

nology, Critical Learning, any true Exercise of Reason, a most irreverent person to Superiors, a Calumniator, a Devil, (and this, for saying we have many ignorant; sottish, and lazy Ministers) an Enemy to the Church, a Separatist; and this he is as confident of, as if he had a Revelation about it. Now I am as confident of the contrary) and who hath made him more infallible than his Neighbor, who, possible, is neither inferior to him in age, nor in the time of his ministration in sacred things? though, it may be, he is not so versed in Justinian's Code, or in Rabanus Maurus, &c.

VII. I hope, Reader, this will excuse me to thee, for not Complementing him with the Title of Reverend Brother any more. I perceive though he once thanks me for my civil treating him, yet another time he is angry, and thinks it was for nothing but to cully him into a Justification of Separation. Alas! it was never in my thoughts; I desire no other Patronage of it than my own Conscience, besides what I confidently expect from one Higher than him. If I have in this Reply reflected more sharply upon him, he bath

An INTRODUCTION, &c.

hath found out my excuse from St. Paul's dealing with *Peter*, Gal. 2. 11. and from *zeal* and *love* for the Truth.

VIII. I shall not introduce thee into my Book, with telling thee the *Vindicators* Book had nothing in it, of any great weight; *False* and *Erroneous Assertions*, that undermine the Exercise of Religion, and the Peace and Welfare of the Church; a strange undertaking that it hath in it *unaccountable Positions*. These should be the *Conclusions* of Books, not the *Beginnings*; and the putting them in *Epistles*, and *Introductions*, is but a setting the Cart before the Horse. I shall leave the Reader to read what hath been said by him, and is replied by me, and then judge of his *Ergo* as thou pleasest, or seest Reason.

IX. Only to make thy Labor as short as I can, I have considered the *Principles* in which we seem really to differ, (for in all Controversies, the business lies in a little room) There are some *Original Principles* wherein the difference lies, which till they be known and agreed, the difference will never be truly understood or healed.

A Syl-

A Sylloge or Collection of the Original Questions that seem to be in difference, betwixt the Author of the Reasonable Account, &c. and Dr. Falkner in his Vindication of Liturgies. As to the point of the Lawfulness of Forms of Prayer to be generally imposed, or used in our Ministerial Acts.

1 Quest. *Whether the distribution of Prayer, into that which is meerly Mental; and that which is not Mental onely, but Vocal also, be a just distribution? I affirm it, because the latter hath an essential part, which the former wants. The Vindicator seems to deny it, Vindication, p. 30. l. 1, 2, 3.*

2 Quest. *Whether words be not an essential part of Vocal Prayer; and these, or those words, an essential part of this or that Vocal Prayer, which no meer man can institute? I affirm it. The Vindicator denies it. Vide Vindication, p. 177. & seq.*

3 Quest. *Whether in an Act of Worship, or any part of it, any can determine what God hath left free to his Ministers and People, excepting those to whom it is so left free? I deny it.*

4 Quest. *Whether an ability fully to express our minds to God in Prayer, may be properly call'd the Gift of Vocal Prayer? I affirm it. The Vindicator denies it. Chap. 1.*

5 Quest. *Whether in Acts of external instituted Worship, or any part of it, any thing can be call'd Order or Decency: Or be said to be Pious, Religious, Devout, and for Edification, antecedaneously, or without respect to the Divine Will, revealed in the Law of Nature, or in Holy Writ? I deny it. The Vindicator affirms it, Chap. 4, &c.*

6 Quest. *Whether, considering the infirmity of our Nature, a Person in Prayer, can keep his thoughts as close to, and have his affection as warm in the Duty, reading a Form, as in speaking from his own conceptions? I deny it. The Vindicator affirms, pag. 75.*

7 Quest. *Whether, where God hath left Minister or People, a liberty to use one, or another mean in an Act of Worship, but commanded all to serve him with the greatest fervor of spirit they can, they be not, by a Divine Precept, obliged to use that means, which, upon experience, they find most conducive to the attention of their thoughts, or fervor of their spirits? I affirm it.*

8 Quest

8 Quest. *Supposing Superiors should command Ministers and People in the Publick Worship, or in their Families, to pray by Forms onely, which they appoint; such a Command were lawful and obliging to them? I deny it. The Vindicator affirms, pag. 193, &c.*

9 Quest. *Whether there be not equal reason for Superiors to command Ministers to perform their Ministerial Acts of Preaching, by reading other mens Sermons: as their Acts of Prayer, by reading others Forms of Prayer? I affirm. The Vindicator denies.*

10 Quest. *Whether the Promises we have in Scripture, of the influence and assistance of the Holy Spirit in Prayer, may not, or do not extend to words, as well as pious and devout affections; or our contending for a liberty, as to words in Prayer, be not a meer Contention for shewing our Parts, and a varying of Phrases? As to the first part I affirm, as to the latter I deny. The Vindicator affirms the latter.*

11 Quest. *Whether Prayer, Preaching, and Administring the Sacraments, be not the main works and parts of a Gospel-Ministers ministrations? I affirm it. The Vindicator denies it.*

12 *Quest.* *Whether if Ministers perform their Acts of Prayer and Preaching, by prescribed Forms of others, and administer the Sacraments by other Forms, than Christ hath given them to use in the case, they, by it, do not transform themselves from Ministers of Christ, to meer Ministers of men?* The last hath not been touched, and may make a *new Argument* in my Case; I must confess the *dread of it*, is not the least thing that aweth me. The *Russian Priests* are brought to think they fulfil *their Ministry* by reading their *Liturgy*, and instead of *Preaching*, reading an *Homily* out of *Chrysostom*. But in these things, whether they approve themselves indeed *Ministers of Christ*, or meer *Servants of Men*, may be considered. The famous *Ministry of England* hath ever been judged another thing; as soon, *Reader*, as thou canst, fix thy answer to these *Questions*, satisfactorily to thy own Conscience, thou wilt be able to determine, whether what I have said in the *Reasonable Account*, &c. or what *Dr. Falkner* hath said in his *Vindication*, be of most weight; and whose Positions are most *extravagant, false and erroneous*.

Legat, & penes Lectorem sit Judicium.

THE INTRODUCTION.

The Vindicator's Title not proper to his Work, nor justly proportioned to the Title or Matter of the Book he pretendeth to answer. The Author of the Reasonable Account, pretends to no Oracular infallibilities, onely to Reason, working on Scriptural Principles. The design of his Book. The Vindicator's false account of it in his Epistle Dedicatory. His slightry apprehensions of it. The Policy of that. The Undertaking not so strange as the Vindicator would make it. The reason why the Arguments may appear to have no weight to the Vindicator, yet may not be so light. The Vindicator's unkind reflection upon the Author, for his want of skill in Chronology, as to the times of Gregory the Great and Charles the Great, shewed to be only produced for sport, and to have nothing of charge in it; but the Vindicator himself hath committed a greater Error about Gregory the Great, making him to have died Fifteen years before Platina saith he was Pope. The Vindicator's declining Syllogistical

B

Arguing

Arguing. The seasonableness of the coming out of the Reasonable Account (through the intervention of Gods Providence) tho the Author at the writing of it had no prospect of any such thing. The Conclusion of the Answer to his Epistle Dedicatory, and Introduction.

1. **T**HE Author hath intituled his Book, *A Vindication of Liturgies* [that is, of what strictly taken, none of any sound mind, ever found fault with] for a *Liturgy* (it ought to be wrote *Liturgy*, tho it be by vulgarer or neglected) signifies nothing, either according to the notation of the word (coming from *λειτουργία*) or the Scriptural usage of it, or the usage of it in the ancientest Writers in *Philology*; or in ancient Ecclesiastical Writers (without an addition to it of *τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν*, or the like) but a *Publick Service* or *Ministry*; but he, by and by adds, *Shewing the Lawfulness, Usefulness and Antiquity of performing the Publick Worship of God by Set Forms of Prayer*. Nor hath any that I know denied this. It is onely the Lawfulness of an *Universal Use* or *Imposition* of *Set Forms*, and those too prescribed by other men, and imposed on all men, that is the matter in question, which by the Title of his Book it seems the Author had no mind to vindicate.

2. He goes on, *In answer to a late Book intituled, A Reasonable Account why some pious Noncon.*

Noncon. Ministers judge it sinful for them to perform their Ministerial Acts in Publick, Solemn Prayer, by the prescribed Forms of others. But how shall a Vindication of Liturgies, shewing the Lawfulness, Usefulness, and Antiquity, of performing the Publick Worship of God by Set Forms; ever answer that Book which meddles not with the Lawfulness of Liturgies, but Forms of Prayer onely composed by those who do not use them, and imposed on them? Nor doth it say they are unlawful, only shews the reasons of some persons why they cannot judge that it is lawful for them to use them.

3. Neither the Author of that Book nor his Friends, pretend to have the Propositions they delivered, suggested to them by the Roman King's Goddess *Ageria*; nor yet whispered to them by *Mahomet's Pigeon*, nor yet impressed upon them, as *John of Leyden* pretended at *Munster*, that his were; nor yet to have had them from the Possessor of any infallible Chair; they pretend to no more than that Light which enlighteneth every man that comes into the World. They think, There is a Spirit in Man, and the Almighty hath given him Understanding; that God hath given all men a Principle inabling men to discourse conclusions from Principles (which we call Reason.) That these Principles are partly connate and natural, partly revealed in Holy Writ; that in matter of Gods Worship their Reason is to work not so much upon the first, as second sort of these Principles; hence

they form *Conclusions*, from comparing *Scripture with Scripture*, in the light of which they walk. And even in this ratiocination they do think *Oprimus Philosophus non nascitur*, and therefore judge none, but walk in their own *Light*, making no *Mens Dictates* or *Decrees*, the Rule of their Practice in the things of God, but crying out, *To the Law and to the Testimony*, and for the determination of the sense of that (as to their own practice) finally resting in the *practical judgment of their own consciences*. If any represent them to the World as *Dunces*, Men that *have nothing to say* for their dissent from others, but doing what they do, out of meer *Faction, Rebellion, Disobedience* to Rulers: They are ready to give a *reasonable account* of their Actions.

3. This was the apparent design of that Book, composed immediately upon the coming out of the *Vindicators Libertas Ecclesiastica*, and more than two years since given to a friend, after which the *Author* never saw it till he saw it in print, and (abating the Errors of the Press) the *Author* sees no cause to put it into his *Retractions*, nor doth believe that one leaf of it will be a grief of heart to him when he comes to die, nor be charged upon him as guilt (with reference to the main matter of it) in the day of Judgment.

But because we will not *believe*, because the *Church* (that is some who call themselves so) believe that *Faith* and *Fervency* are the gift

gift of *Vocal Ministerial Prayer* (which is no better than Nonsense) and that there is a *Natural, Eternal, Order and Decency* (left to the liberty of Rulers to specify in particulars) *antecedent to the will of God* concerning external Worship, to which the plain precepts of God for *attention and fervency in Prayer* must give place, and be by it regulated; or that words are no *essential part* of *Ministerial Publick Prayer*, and some other such like unintelligible things; and as unscriptural, we must be exposed at this rate for most unparallell'd Dunces, and Rebels to Authority, and persons, who (to use our Vindicators words in the close of his Introduction) *vent Notions to widen our Breaches, and such as are inconsistent with the publick establishment of a Church, and which put advantages into the hands of other Enemies; the drift whereof tends to confusion, and the matter of them is unsound and untrue: when as in truth the imposition of Forms of Prayer on all Ministers, and inforcing them to use, and all the people to hear them, hath been the source of all our Breaches; and most if not all, and those the purest Churches, are established without any such imposition: and they are only used amongst our greatest adversaries, from whom it is that we are reformed (as all men know) such mysteries of sense some men speak in their passion.*

4. From hence may appear how truly the *Vindicator* tells his *Reverend Diocesan* in

the *Epistle Dedic.* 'That for justifying our
'Seperation, I have adventured so far as to
'charge the general use of *Forms of Prayer*
'to be sinful, which (if it were true) would
'indeed be a high accusation against our
'Publick Worship.

The matter is neither so, nor so, if the
Vindicator doth not judge this good Logick.
What some pious men judge as to themselves un-
lawful, is certainly and absolutely so; which
is so weak, as every one will see the incon-
sequence of it. Our *Vindicator* will hardly
be pleased to hear me tell my Reader, That
there is not much truth to be expected from
him who so manifestly prevaricates in the
first leaves, nor consistency from him; the
second p. of whose *Epistle Dedicatory* agreeth
no better with his *Title page*; tho p. 138,
he minds his Reader, That he may not rea-
sonably expect any accuracy in the right com-
putation for the birth, and first product of
Liturgies, from me who talks so loosely and
falsly about the Age wherein Gregory the
Great lived; when yet the mistake was his
own, not mine, as I shall hereafter fully
shew.

5. I am beholden to the *Vindicator*, for
allowing me both in his *Epistle Ded.* (and else
where) to have stated my *Question* plainly,
and then produced my *Arguments*, but I am
not so far engaged to him, for owning no
more in my Book, than slender and weak
appearances of Reason, and what was not like
to prevail much with understanding men —
wanting

wanting strength of Argument. But these things being yet in Issue, I shall say nothing to them, save on'y this, That in some causes it is necessary to *fore speak Readers*, and more *politick* to prejudice them, then to leave them to their own judgments; for the *strength* of the Argument I shall once more try that with them, and examine whether he indeed hath as he saith, *This great advantage to have manifest truth on his side.*

6. In his *Introduction*, p. 1, 2. He tells us he thought my *Undertaking strange*, and that in my Book he found *nothing of any great weight*. I am not much concerned at his thinking my *Undertaking strange* (nothing freer then thoughts.) But why strange? Was it not the contrary Opinion that broke the Church at *Frankfort* in the beginning of our Reformation? Was it not 100 years since disputed in *Latine* betwixt one *Carpenter*, and an *English Minister* fled into *Holland*? My self hath the printed Copy of it; hath not Mr. *Cotton* long since declared his judgment against the lawfulness (a *Prophet without Honour* from a party in *his own Countrey*) but whose name is not only very honourable to multitudes at this day in *England*, but over all the World where the Gospel is Preached. Hath not the judgment of the Churches in *New-England*, been the same, if not more rigid then mine? Hath it not been the judgment of the Church of *Scotland* ever since the *Reformation*? Nay

is it not the judgment of all Reformed Churches at this day, where Liturgies are only prescribed, and left at liberty? Why then should this undertaking be so strange? Especially considering, that himself tells us in his *Epistle Dedicatory*. That the Genius of the Non-con. Party is much set against them, and in their Practice they generally reject them eagerly.

3. Tho indeed he saith in his *Epistle*, That the more cautious and wary Men amongst us dissenters will not Affirm the constant use of Forms Sinful, because they think such a Position not defensible. But the question is, Whether those Cautious, Wary Men, will not affirm. The Universal use and imposition of Forms of Prayer in Publick Worship, and such Forms too, as were never prescribed by God, or Christ, or any Prophets or Apostles unlawful. I never yet met with one such Dissenter, tho never so Wary and Cautious; and thus much I dare say, That in the whole County where our *Vindicator* lives, there is not one single Dissenting Minister would take up a Living upon that single Term, tho many of them indure hardship enough. But this is a trick used to perswade our Rulers, that that is a point of difference betwixt very few Dissenters and them, whereas they know the contrary; and as to our Brethren of the Congregational Perswasion, and the Anabaptists, they cannot but know that there is not a man of them judgeth Forms of Prayer generally used or imposed, lawful;

lawful ; and I dare assure him , that of the *Presbyterians* , there is not one of forty so judgeth them.

7. But I am more concerned to inquire whether there be nothing in my Book of *any great weight*. &c. I have observed in *Shors* , that the judgment of the *Weight of Wares* hath much depended upon the *Scales and Weights* used , and the *hand of him* that pretends to set the *Ballance* even ; an *Unrighteous Thumb and Finger* , often makes a *Commodity* appear light , which hath weight enough. I must therefore crave leave to examine the *Scales and Weights* , by which our *Vindicator* hath taken his Measures , and see whether some unlucky *Thumb and Finger of Prejudice* , or *Passion* , hath not caused my Ware to be pronounced so light , and intreat my *Reader* to weigh it over again in the *Ballance of the Sanctuary* , with the *Sealed Weights of Scripture and Right Reason* , and then to pass a deliberate Judgment ; and shall onely tell our *Vindicator* , that it was no good *Logick* , to put the *ergo* before the *Premises* : he should first have shewed the *Weakness and Lightness* of them , and have left these expressions for his *Conclusion* , others (and those learned Men) are not all of his mind ; and because he is so confident , upon me let it rest to justify their *Weight* , and further to prove that he hath been so far from proving any *Antiquity* for any general use , or *Impositions* of *Forms of Prayers* to

be used by all *Ministers* in their *publick Ministrations* for 600 years after Christ, that it is a thing *not proveable*, and which no wise and learned man can undertake the proof of, only *Aliquid dicendum, in nihil dicant*; and what is wanting in just matter, must be made up with many and big words.

8. He saith right, *That the design of his former Book is made void by my undertaking (if what I say be true)* which I very well knew, *Es frustra sit perplura, &c.* be the particular Forms used in our Church, as good as they will, it is nothing to us, who would never have entred the Ministry, if we had not thought we had, and been judged by those who set us apart to the work, to have had some ability to *Pray* as well as *Preach*, and having so, judg it Sinful not to perform our *Ministerial Acts* in the use of that gift.

9. The *Author* of the *Reasonable Account, &c.* did not set his name, not desiring that his Arguments should derive any *Repute*, or *Disrepute* from him: What matters it whether the Author be a wise Man or a Fool, the question is, What his Arguments in the Case are, *Sape etiam solitor est opportuno locutor.* But he chargeth me deeply, when he says p. 3. *That it is observable, that when I write concerning the Ancient Practice of the Church after the Apostles times, or any thing written in those days, it is generally done so loosely, and*
sometimes

sometimes with such wonderful extravagancy, as may surprize an intelligent Reader, with some kind of Admiration. Says he so? Wherein? He will give but one instance, which he saith is in my 68, 69 pages, speaking of the Original of Liturgies, I say,

"We do believe, that Gregory the Great, under the Protection of Charles the Great, was the Father of all those that dwell in these Tents, and that 800 or a 1000 years after Christ. My words in that place are these,

"To bring this point to an Issue, there was a Book published 1662, called, A sober and temperate Discourse concerning the Interest of words in Prayer. The Reader may there at large see what we judg concerning the Original of Liturgies, when our Reverend Brother, or any for him, shall have given a strict Reply to the 3. and 4. Chapters in that Book, we shall think they have more to say for their Antiquity, then we have yet seen. In the mean time we do believe that Gregory the Great (usually said to be the worst of all Popes that went before him) under the Protection of Charles the Great was the Father of all those who dwell in these Tents, and that 800 or 1000 years after Christ. He leaves out the first part, and the reference to the other Book.

The truth is, it was too *Elliptically* expressed, towards a Person that sought an occasion

occasion to *Carp* and *Reflect*; which that our *Vindicator* did, too much appears from his taking notice of what was p. 68, 69. of a book which had not above 180. pages in it, or thereabouts. In the 4 p. of his Answer, and then again in p. 138. of his Answer, in both which places, he makes sport with it, at such a rate as were unpardonable, but that it was just about *Prevarication* time at *Cambridge*, and indeed it was a thing fitter to make sport for boys than men, who understand any thing of Sense, and have any judgment.

10. He comes upon it with a *Firstly*, *Secondly*, *Thirdly*, then makes Application suitably, which he pursueth p. 138. and amplifies with a *Rabbinical Story*, and shuts up his *Reflection* with a very pretty *Jest*. His words are these,

"To speak of *Gregory the great* 800 or
 "1000 years after Christ, is far enough
 "from truth, when he dyed about the
 "year 1604; and Secondly that *Gregory the*
 "*great* should be under the Protection of
 "*Charles the great*, is impossible, when
 "he was dead about 200 years before
 "*Charles the great* began his Reign. And
 "3ly. It is altogether as inaccountable that
 "*Liturgies* had their *Original*, either in
 "the time of *Gregory* or *Charles the great*,
 "when they were in use many 100 years
 "before them both, *Quod est demonstrandum*.
 "Then he comes to Application. This
 "mistake concerning these Persons, whose
 "Names are so famous in History, that a
 "Man

"Man of ordinary reading could not be
 "unacquainted with them, is, as if any
 "person should presume to give account of
 "the Church of the Israelites, and should
 "assert that the offering of Sacrifices under
 "the Mosaical Law, had its beginning
 "in the days of *Eli* the Priest, in the
 "Reign of *K. Jehosaphat*, 600 or 800
 "years after the Israelites came out of
 "*Egypt*. *This is a great piece of ignorance*
 "*and error : That's the first use.* Surely it
 "is a strange confidence for any person to
 "vent such things and to write positively
 "what he no better understandeth. *The*
Author therefore of the Reasonable Account, is
an ignorant confident person. That is the
 2d. use, p. 138. Therefore *we must not*
 "*reasonably expect any accuracy in the right*
 "computation of the time of the birth and
 "first production of Liturgies from him
 "who talks so loosely and falsely, about the
 "Age in which *Gregory the great* lived;
 "whom he would make the Father of them.
 Therefore *Sirs you are not to believe anything*
this Author saith on this Argument. That is
 the 3d, and main use. And it is speaking
 "enough at random, to fix their Original
 "now at 600 after at 800, then at a
 "10000 years after Christ; for the Author
 contradicts himself, and cannot tell whether
 it was at 6 or 800, or 1000 years after
 Christ (that is the English of this, and
 inforceth the last branch of Application)
 I shall repeat our *Vindicators* words no
 further,

further , let him please himself and such Readers (as such trifles will please) with his *Rabbinical Tradition* about *Phinehas*, and his fancy (to reconcile my words to truth) that *Gregory* might live 400 years , and then have need of *Charles* the great to govern him in his dottage: I shall reconcile what I said , to truth and sense , at a more intelligible rate.

II. What a *Magnus conatus*, here is *Nugas agere* ! I. In the first place every Scholar knows , that in matters of Chronology , it is our Custom to consult some *Chronologer* or other *Pro re nata* , and that it is no piece of Learning to carry in Memory the Years of Mens Births or Deaths (Reason being not at all concerned in the case) but when we have occasion to take notice of any such thing , we use to look into them; and Dr. *Cave's* Tables are continually in mine eye while I am in my Study , and *Helvicus* within a reach; the one of which presently telleth me *Gregory* the greats time , and the other *Charles* the greats; so as the *Vindicator* hath not shewn much of his own *Judgment* or *Ingenuity*, in making one so mightily defective in learning , meerly for mistaking the time of a *Pope* or *Emperors* Reign : and as confident as himself is that *Gregory* dyed 604 ,

I am sure *Platina* saith, he entred his *Pope-dom* 610 , which (according to our *Vindicator* (who is so severe a Critick in Chronology) was six years after he was dead ;
whic h

which would make a better Argument than any of the Papists have, to prove *Gregory a most Holy Father*, having spent six years in Heaven, and received a better *Canonization* than the Church of *Rome* could give him, and then came down (not without Gods leave sure, to be his Sons *Vicar*, and to rule his Church on Earth. Now who so considers, that *Platina* was a later *Popes Secretary*, and so had doubtless the command of their *Archives*, and *Abbreviator Apostolicus*; so as it was his business to search into the things of that Church, may reasonably think he much better knew than our *Vindicator* could, his *Chronology*, yea, or than any other *Monk*, or more ordinary *Religioso*; and to correct *Platina* by any of them, is much like setting the Sun by ones Watch. *Qui alterum incusat probri ipsum se intueri oportet.* If any one object that my self says, *Gregory* was not Pope till about 600 (as I believe I have said more than once in this Discourse) or that he lived *Anno 600*, every one will understand me as expressing *Numerum Rotundum*, the number of the age only, not the particular year; and that my meaning was at the close of the 6th, or beginning of the 7th Age: but if one will pretend to the very year of his death, and say he died 604, he is tied to more exactness, for fear a Resurrection be proved upon the Assertor, admitting his Assertion.

12. But this being premised, let us more strictly inquire, Whether there was such a mistake

mistake or no? In very deed there was none, and all this noise is caused from our *Vindicators* applying that to persons which I never intended, but of the *practice* and *usage*; for what else could I understand by *the Father of all those that dwell in these Tents*? but the Father of those who have introduced into the Church, the general use and imposition of Forms of Prayers to be used by all Ministers, in their Publick Solemn Prayers?

I said and I say it again, That *Gregory the Great* was the Father of these men; he first made a *Canon* in the case. I mean a Rule or Decree; I think *Durandus* or *Platina*, use the term *Redegit in Canonem*. This Canon was charged but with Powder, and did no great execution, till *Charles the Great*; near 200 years after that, added a Bullet to *Gregorys* Powder; this did great Execution, for he enforced all men with *Fire and Sword*; and this I think was a great protection of *Gregory the Greats* Canonical Sanction. *Charles* his Empire was large, and we must imagine that a year or two, or twenty, would not perfect so great an alteration, no not in the *Roman Empire* (which was not all the Christian World) so as I do think that it is no large conjecture, to guess it might be 1000 years before this practice got any general usage. This Cubb was whelped by *Gregory the Great*, but all his Authority and Canons, &c. could not lick it into a just form, till *Charles the Great* put his Mouth
to

to it, and his Hand and Sword also; which must be in the Ninth Century, and cannot well be imagined to have been perfected in a small time. I believe when I come to our *Vindicators* p 156, 157. I shall find (if not a designed Cheat) a grosser Error in Chronology than this amounts to; for this indeed is none. The *Vindicator* might have seen in the Book to which I referred in that Paragraph, that I did know, or might have read there (and I will assure him I read it once or twice) what time *Gregory the Great* lived, and at what distance from *Charles the Great*. And the World may see by a *Supplement to the Reasonable Account*, which came out the very same week with this *Vindication of Liturgies*, and is wholly about the pretended *Antiquity of Liturgies*; that I was not ignorant of this abstruse and mighty piece of Learning, and needed not his Instruction in it.

13. Our *Vindicator* in the next place (*Introd. p. 5.*) declareth against his meddling with any part of the *Reasonable Account*, wherein I answered others, which I am well content with, and shall likewise desire my Reader, not to expect I should strictly follow him in his large *Digressions*, wherein he speaketh nothing to my *Arguments*. But he further tells us, 'That he shall wave the
' *Repetition of my long Syllogisms, which is a*
' *tedious way of proceeding, and in rational dis-*
' *courses of this nature is acceptable to few others,*
' *than those who may admire the Art of making a*
C *Syllogism;*

Syllogism; but I shall give a faithful account of the substance of his Arguments, &c.

14. I must confess I never thought it much material, whether a *Syllogism* were in *Cesare*, or *Daraptie*, or *Ferison*, nor thought it worth the while to dispute the mysteries of the structure of a *Syllogism*; but I am to learn that a *Syllogistical* disputing is more tedious than that more ungirt way, which it seems pleaseth our Author better. A *Prosyllogism* I always thought very proper; and I have troubled him with no more in any Argument. But *Latet anguis in herba* (I fear) had our *Vindicator* tied up himself to *Syllogisms*, he would hardly have been able to have crouded in this momentous Proposition — *The Author of the Reasonable Account, did not know what time Gregory the Great or Charles the Great lived.* Nor got in this conclusion. *Ergo*, He was an ignorant man, defective in learning, very confident, from whom no accuracy is to be expected. But let him run his looser method (for certainly *Logick* and *Syllogistical* arguing, is the *Palma contracta*) if he so discourseth that I can but understand, whether he denys the *Major* or the *Minor*, or the *Conclusion* onely, it shall be enough for my purpose.

15. For what follows, I have said enough before to excuse me from any imputation; as to the time of my Book coming out, which was in 1679, about *Mich.* it was printed beyond Sea six moneths before; I had no concern in it, nor seen it since *April* 1677, when I gave

gave it to a friend, who begg'd it of me.

But so various are our Apprehensions, that my opinion is, it could never have come out in a more *seasonable time*; when it is in the heart of our *Rulers* to unite all *Protestants*, which I am sure cannot be, while the *Imposition of Forms of Prayer on all Ministers*, in their *publick Ministerial Service* in Prayer holds. But may easily be, by leaving *such Forms to liberty*. I do very well know what a *clamour some make for Imposed Forms*; and therefore think it is highly necessary we should tell them why we judge them (as to our practice) unlawful, that our *Rulers* and *People* may judge, whether we be such *illiterate, nonsensical, irrational, persons, such strange undertakers, and meer confident men*, as we are represented to the World to be: Or whether these Clamours be meerly *Crys of Interest*, like that of old, *Great is Diana of the Ephesians*. So I have done with our *Vindicators* Introduction. Only desiring my *Reader* may know that I am not arguing *Forms of Prayer* (now most generally used and imposed) unlawful; but justifying the *Reasons* which I have formerly given, *why we cannot judge them, as to our practice, lawful*, let them be in themselves what they shall be evinced to be. If our *Vindicator* can quit himself of the *Arguments* I have brought, I have no more at present to say.

CHAP. I.

An Answer to the Vindicators First Chapter, concerning the stating of the Question.

1. **I** Am beholden to the Learned *Author*, for allowing me, or any *Noncon.* an ability to state a *Question*, with *sufficient plainness and clearness*; and shall requite him, owning that he hath truly repeated my stating of it (a favour not ordinary in this age.) But his Observations deduced from my Concessions, must not pass wholly unexamined.

2. That our Prayers must be *directed to God* (as he observeth) needed not the attestation of two of the Fathers. 2. That our *general wants* (such as *Pardon, Sanctification, Daily Bread, &c.* I like not so well to say all our *ordinary wants*) may be expressed in *Forms*, I doubt not. Nor 3. That a *pious Soul, not able to pray from his own Gifts, may truly worship God mentally*, by reading a *Form*, I doubt not; but to make this *true external worship*, I think will be required a command from God. It is also true, that one difference betwixt *Praying with and without a Form*, is that in the *former way*, the *same words and methods are constantly used*, in the other not so. But if by praying we mean

mean the *Action of a Man*, the main difference contended for, is, *That he that prayeth in the use of his Gifts, doth the will of God; whether the other doth so, is the very Question.*

3. And so indeed the *Answerer* tells us, only represents it something too invidiously; for no man saith, *That God is pleased with our varying of phrases, or altering our methods;* but we are sure God is pleased with our doing of his will, in as little things as those are. It certainly had been vain Philosophy under the *Jewish Pædagogy*, to have argued that it was not probable that God saw any beauty or valuableness in the killing of a Beast, for he was a Spirit, and true Goodness, Piety, and Sincerity are the things which he delighted in. Who knows not all this? But he is pleased in obeying his will in the least things. The Question therefore is, *What is Gods Will in the case.*

To obey God is certainly better than Sacrifice, and needs must be, because all the value of a Sacrifice lay in the obedience testified by it. If it be the will of God that his Ministers should serve him in the use of their own Gifts (from whence must necessarily follow the altering of Phrases and Methods) though there be no intrinsic value in these things, yet they are better then all other Sacrifices.

4. But our Author thinketh not this probable. And why? 1. Because our Saviour rebuked the vanity of them, who think they shall be heard by their much speaking; *Mat. 6. 7.* And as a Remedy, taught his Disciples that com-

prehensive Form of Prayer. *Austine* from hence
 What he saith judged *superfluity of words*
 as to the Lords needles; so did *Hilary*; and
 Prayer, is else- it is a piece of *Reverence* in-
 where, spoken to. joyned by *Solomon*; *Eccl. 5.*
 2.

5. But what is all this but a wasting of
Ink and Paper? May not then a Minister
 pray in the use of his own Gifts, unless he
 prayeth to an *unreasonable length*? Must he
 needs use a *superfluity of words*, or a *multi-*
tude of words, because he doth not use those
 words others have prepared for him? Who
 seeth not these inconsequences?

6. In the next place, p. 14. he argues, *Be-*
cause under the Law God did not require daily
various changes of the real expressions of Reli-
gious Worship and Service, but appointed them
to be continually the same; *Num. 28, 2, 3.* which
maketh it more than probable that the variety
of verbal expressions is not requisite to obtain
his acceptance under the Gospel.

I do not wonder that our Author at first
 (though of Learning enough to make them,
 and answer Arguments in that Form) de-
 clared his dislike of the use of Sylogisms;
 for if such Arguments as this be put into
 these Forms, they would be too much ex-
 posed. Is there the same reason for the Ser-
 vice of God under the Gospel, as under the
 Law? because *Typical Services* prefiguring
one Christ, were *invariable*; must therefore
Spiritual Services under the Gospel be so too?
 consider then why the Minister doth not
 always

always preach the *same Sermons*, because the Jews were to offer *Morning and Evening Sacrifices*, and we under the *Gospel* are also bound to pray in all parts of time; must therefore the Will of God be that in all things else they should agree? Is there the same reason for the performance of *Acts of Worship*, after the plentiful effusion of the Spirit in the days of *Pentecost* as before? Nay, is our Author sure, that in the *Jewish Worship* they all used the same *Prayers and Exhortations*, because they always killed the same *specifical Beasts* for *Sacrifices*? In their very *Sacrifices* there was a great variety, and they agreed in nothing, but that they all were what God prescribed.

7. What he saith in p. 15. is granted him, nothing but the *will of God* is worth naming in the cause, words in themselves are not valuable, but *obedience* is. What makes then this trifling about the *Opinions of Heathens*, the *invaluableness of words* in themselves, the way of *Worship* under the *Law*, &c. What is all this to any purpose, but to prepossess the unwary Reader?

8. His next observation is, That the Author doth not account himself certain of the truth of this *Position*. What doth he mean by certain? The Author is none of the *Infalibles* of our Age, and hath more modesty than to dictate to all the World, and pretend *Demonstrations* of a thing that it may be is not capable of it: But he is *morally certain*, certain, as far as *probable Arguments*

can make him. But what then? Therefore it appears not to him unlawful? Will any weighed Divine in the World say: That a thing is not unlawful to him, that upon Arguments, which to him appeareth highly probable, appears unlawful? Let the *Author* answer a Book called, *To è ἀπὸν*, wrote on this very Argument.

9. The *Author* values not a rush, whether the Answerer blames, or not blames him, for the thing, some persons in this Age calls *Separation*. He falls not by Mans Judgment. There was an *Apostacy* which *Luther* gloried in; and there is a *Separation* which a good Christian may glory in; 1 Cor. 6. 17. The Question is, Whether the *Nonconf.* be guilty of a sinful *Separation*? That *Nonconf.* are guilty of that, here is no Argument to prove; but the *Author* accounting himself certain, mentioned p. 21. which is a new Topick; for I hope it is no *Demonstration*.

10. The *Vindicator*, p. 22. in the next place, comes to tell us of considerable prejudices against the truth of my Assertion. 1. That it is against the Opinion of the Church of England, and the most famous Churches in the Primitive times. But to the latter part of this he very honestly adds — a *Quæd est Demonstrandum*; referring it to be afterwards proved. And against the constitution of many eminent Churches abroad. This he saith he before observed; and I do not deny, observe good Reader how I have not denyed it, .69p.

'An imposed Liturgy, unless in a particular Province, for a time, in a particular case, such as was that of the spreading of Pelagianism, we cannot find. And for a Liturgy to be proposed onely, and left at liberty, we know most Reformed Churches have such a one, and we have before declared our judgments for the reasonableness of it.

It is true which I also said, That the continuance of Liturgies, owes it self, in a great measure, to Churches not having Men enough able to pray without Forms. But what is this to the purpose of Universally Imposed Liturgies? From this appeareth the exceeding vanity of what the Answerer addeth, p. 23. The Author condemned none of the first Reformers of Sin, nor hath reason to believe that all of them used any such thing, if they had he condemneth them not.

11. But the Author (and those of his mind, are such pitiful men, as determine in these weighty things, according to their present humour. For one while he saith, Authority or Practice is a lamentable Argument. His words are these: p. 23.

While we are disputing about what is lawful, or unlawful, Authority or Practice, is a lamentable Argument. They must be lamentable Divines that will say otherwise. That the Practice of Men should determine to us the will of God.

Well, But he saith in another place, 'The *Sensus piorum*, neither is nor ever was judged light, by persons of sobriety and

and worth, for the truth of a proposition, especially a practical proposition, not plainly determined in Holy Writ.

Is then the *Authority and Practice of particular men*, that have the good hap to get into a *Chair of Government* in the Church; and the *Sensus piorum*, the same thing think we? I beg the Answerers favour if I do not believe it; but believe there must be, to say no more, the odds of 200 to one. The *Sensus piorum* is the *general sense of persons* in such or such a place, minding the things of God, and regulating their lives in a conformity to his will: I take this in practical matters, to be a thousand times more probable Argument, then some particular persons (tho Governours) *Authority and Practice*.

12. But it seems I so stated my Question, as to overthrow the main foundation and the chief Arguments of my Discourse. That indeed is great weakness. But I pray how doth this appear to be any thing but a most false calumny.

I granted, That Forms of Prayer by God commanded in Scripture, must be used, and other Scriptural Forms may be used as part of our Prayer; yet I declare it sinful for such Ministers as can pray otherwise to pray by Forms: From the duty of using their own Gifts, And, 2. From the hinderance of pious Disposition, Attention, or Fervency, from the use of a Form of words in Prayer.

Do I lo? Judge good Reader. The
Minor

Minor of my first Argument is this :

‘But for a Minister having the gift of Prayer, *Reasonable Account* p. 6.
 ‘Ministerial Act in Prayer.
 ‘by reading or reciting Forms of Prayer
 ‘er composed by others, *confessedly not*
 ‘*divinely inspired*; is for him to omit a
 ‘natural and proper means, given him by
 ‘God, &c. It is true, in my Second Argument, p. 23. all these words are by the Printers carelessness left out [by *Forms of Prayer composed by others, confessedly not divinely inspired*] nor could I help it; but a man of any ordinary candor would have supplied them, from the state of the Question, and from the preceding Argument; which will make it appear, that I never said that it was unlawful to perform our Ministerial Act in Prayer, by *Forms*, but by *Forms composed by others, who confessedly are not divinely inspired*. I never was so simple as not to allow God to dispense with his own Law, upon which ground any *Forms commanded by God* must be *lawful*; nor yet to think we might not use *Scriptural phrases*, in any part of worship, and yet use *our own gifts* at the same time too.

13. For to pray nothing else, but using a Scriptural Form, I believe we must have a special Command of God to make that lawful to us.

Besides, I doubt not but the Answerers saw what I wrote, p. 51. *That there is a vast*

vast difference between the pure words of God (for the which God both hath and ever will secure a Reverence in all Religious Souls, and Forms composed by fallible men without any direction from God. Let any Christian experience whether it be possible for him, to read any Book of mans making a thousand times, with that Gift and holy Reverence, and with so little tædium, as he may so read the Books and Chapters of Holy Writ. So as all he saith is just nothing to the purpose, the Author at first restraining his Question to Forms composed by Men, that are confessedly no part of Holy Writ. For Forms, that are part of Holy Writ, they are throughout his Book excepted, nor doth he any where conclude they hinder pious Dispositions, or that they may not be used as part of the exercise of the Ministerial Gift. But something must be said to expose Authors instead of answering him.

14. In his 25 page, to raise up a prejudice against the Author, he very learnedly passeth from Prayer of one kind to Prayer of another kind, and concludeth; That because he sinneth not, who joyneth with another ministering in Prayer, when it is apparent by all Scripture, that he is not to pray vocally, but onely to pray in his heart: Therefore he sinneth not who doth it ministering in Prayer, when he is to pray vocally not mentally onely. It is easie to raise such prejudices, and for ordinary Readers to see through them.

15. Our Authors last prejudice mentioned against the Authors Opinion [*That a great part, and he thinks the greater part of the Nonconformists, will not own his Notion*] I fear will appear an hasty prejudging the *Nonconformists*.

16. Though the *Answerer* speaks warily in the case of the *Commissioners* appointed, 1662 (for he onely saith, *They made this no part of their Objections*) yet he would plainly suggest they (who by the way, except the *Episcopal men*, were all *Presbyterians*) were of another mind. What to say for those who attended not the Commission, I cannot tell, but for those who appeared, and daily met, till they had wholly drawn up what they intended to propose to my Lords the *Bishops*, I can tell. The *Bishops* desired them to meet by themselves, which they did at Mr. Calamy's House, till they had agreed all, which afterward they offered at the *Savoy* to the *Bishops*. What they agreed in this point may be read in these words in their *Seven General Proposals*:

"That the Gift of Prayer being one special qualification for the work of the Ministry bestowed by Christ in order to the Edification of his Church, and to be exercised for the profit and benefit thereof, according to its various and emergent necessities, It is desired that there may be no such Imposition of the Liturgy, as that the Exercise of that Gift be totally excluded in any part of *Publick Worship*."

17. That

17. That Men may not please themselves with Dreams, and think those last were meer compleatory words, upon which no stress was laid, I will assure them, that that *Proposal* had never been agreed without them; they being brought in by the Reverend Mr. Mat. Newcomb, after (as I remember) three days spent in debates about that *Proposal*. I do know but three Men of those who appeared and would declare their minds, who would hear of any *Liturgy Universally Imposed*. Those three indeed were great Men. The most Reverend Bishop Reynolds was one, Mr. Calamy was another, the third yet living I shall not name. Mr. Calamy often urged,

That if forms of Prayer were lawful, the Imposing of them did not make them unlawful.

It was answered, If forms of Prayer were *Universally* lawful, *Imposing* could not make them unlawful: but it was denied, *That they were, as to use in publick Devotion, Universally lawful.*

18. The debate of the 19 *General Proposals*, was the ordinary work of the Commissioners met together. In the mean time they had, according to the *Instructions* of their Commission, committed the several Offices of the old *Liturgy* to several Brethren, to be reviewed, that they might see what exceptions were reasonable to be offered. The drawing up a *New Form* was committed to another. These in their Seasons were brought in and read. But the far Major part of

of the *Commissioners* present; having obtained the 7th *Proposal*, and in that a perfect liberty of the *use* or *not use* of any, were very incurious, as to those things, only listened so far to them, as to see there was nothing but what they might own. This is the truth of that story, so far as it passed, before they came to give in what they agreed, to receive the *Bishops Answer*, [and to make their *Reply*, What was then done, the *Printed Account* fully tells us.

19. This is enough to have spoken to this *Chapter* of the Reverend Doctors; only I must requite him, with thanks for his *Complements*, the good Milk wherewith he suckles me, and tho he presently with an oblique stroak of his heel throws it down again, yet I have such a value for it, as in the following Chapters I shall endeavour to gather it up, and (if such a thing be possible for a *Non-Con.*) redeem my reputation, from such an ugly imputation as the writing of *absurda*, inconsistencies.

C H A P. II.

An Answer to the Vindicators Second Chapter, concerning the Gift of Prayer. Whether the Gift of Prayer, as to Vocal Prayer, be properly an Ability to express our minds to God in Prayer,

or

or whether it be the same with the Grace given us to be used in Prayer, or an Extraordinary Gift, peculiarly relating to the Apostles and Christians, in their Age?

1. **A**LL this while methinks I have been in a *Drapers Shop*, staring upon the lofty and *Oblique Lights*, which I discerned in it, and wondering wherefore (to make up a judgment whether the Sun shined or no) I must be put to a troublesome elevation of my Eye, stretching my Nerves, and contracting my Eye-lids, till at last I discerned the Art, and that a nearer and more direct light, though it might have been (possibly) of more advantage to the buyer, yet to the seller would have been less profitable, giving his Customer a too near an advantage to judge of his Wares and the Arts used about them.

2. I had thought that in the beginning of the former Chapter, *The Issue was joyned*, or (as the *Civilians* speak) we had had *Litem contestatam*: The Question was stated. The Opponent agreed it clearly and plainly stated. The Arguments were brought: What had an Answerer to do, but to deny one or other Proposition, or to distinguish of some Terms? Twelve Pages since that have been spent, and nothing of this done: To what purpose is this prejudicating a Reader? but to possess his mind one way before the cause is tried;

tryed ; and to raise his passion with *strange* stories , before he be suffered to use his Reason to judge who hath the best cause upon hearing what each party can say : But at length we shall (it may be) come to something which is to the purpose.

3. The first Argument was stated thus.

To omit a mean for the performance of a Religious Act given us by God for the performance of it, and being natural, and proper, at the command of man, when we perform that Religious Act, is sinful. Reasonable Account. p. 5.

But for a Minister, having the Gift of Prayer, ordinarily to perform his Ministerial Act in Prayer, by reading or reciting Forms of Prayers composed by others (confessedly not divinely inspired) is for him to omit, a natural and proper mean given him by God, in order to the performance of such Religious Act, and in the Omission of it to perform such Religious Act. Ergo,

The Major Proposition shineth so much in its own light, that it was not to be denied, but by affirming, That it is lawful for us at the command of Men, in an Act of Gods Worship to omit a mean given us of God for that end, and to perform that Act in the use of other means, under no special prescription from God ; which is to say, it is lawful to allow Men to be wiser than God in directing the means of his Worship ; which certainly is a strange position.

4. Yet our Answerer, tho he will not in plain terms deny the *Major*, p. 57. tells us, *That a mean given us of God, if it be only capable of being used, and not a necessary mean to be used, may lawfully be omitted, especially when there are several means.* What doth he mean by *several means*? Several means given by God for that end, that are *Natural* and *Proper*, then it is most true. But it lieth upon him to prove that *God hath in this case prescribed several means.* But if he means several *Humane means* under no Divine Prescription, it amounteth to no less then I said before; the præference of the Wisdom of Men to the Wisdom of God.

5. What doth he mean by telling us, *A Divine mean may be omitted, if it be not necessary to be used*, when the very drift of the Argument is to prove, *That it is necessary to be used*, because it is a *Divine Mean*, and there is no other can lay claim to that *Notion*, nor can be so *Natural*, nor is so *Proper*. Now this quite spoiles the retorting the Argument.

6. But altho our Answerer thinks fit to nibble a little about the *Major*, yet plainly discerning, that was not to be denied by any Person of his Reputation in the World, his whole force is spent about the *Minor Proposition*, as to which he saith much; which himself summeth up, p. 57.

1. *That an ability fitly to express our mind to God in Prayer, is not the gift of Prayer nor,*

nor any singular or peculiar gift of the Spirit of God.

2. That it is neither a duty nor yet expedient, that such abilities should be used and constantly used, any further then i^t agreeable to the Rules of Edification and^s Order.

7. Whatsoever our *Answerer* saith upon the first head (which is very much, one while confounding the Gift of prayer, and the Grace of Prayer, as one and the same thing; another while telling us of an *Extraordinary Gift of Prayer*) is so much from the purpose, that our *Author* owns it as a digression p. 28. So as I am not concerned in any thing of that discourse further then to mend a Term in my *Minor*, and make it to run thus:

But for a Minister having an Ability fitly to express his mind to God in Prayer, to perform his Ministerial Acts in Prayer ordinarily by reading or reciting &c.

Nor was there any need at all thus to mend it, but to save my self trouble of a *Word-bait*.

8. But yet to vindicate my self from being as much out, as to proper speaking, as it seems to this *Author*, I was in my *Chronology* of Gregory and Charles the great; we will have a few words about the Gift of Prayer, for I do suspect that this multitude of words, is but to darken knowledge. It shall go under the Title of a *Digression*, in Reply to a *Digression* of the *Answerers* con-

cerning the *Gift of Prayer*. I hope the Reader will pardon my going out of my way, seeing it is but to follow my Leader, and to Vindicate my self from *improper speaking* [that is, not to this *Learned Mans* mind, or Sentiment] and who but Men of his Principles can speak Properly?

9. He doth p. 40. acknowledge, *That there is an Ability in many Persons, whereby they can express their Minds in some degrees fitly to God in Prayer*: But this he saith is not properly the *Gift of Prayer*, but rather of *Speech*: Here then is the Question, The Scripture no where mentioning the *Gift of Prayer*, whether an *Ability to express our Minds fitly to God in Prayer*, may not properly be called the *Gift of Prayer*? My opinion is, *That it may*; which I thus prove.

10. By the same reason, That an *Ability to speak, to Men to Edification, and Exhortation, and Comfort*. 1 Cor. 14. 3. is in Scripture, called the *Gift of Prophecy*; 1 Cor. 13. 2. 1 Cor. 14. 1. An *Ability also fitly to express our Minds to God in Prayer*, may be properly called the *Gift of Prayer*. But such an *Ability* is in Scripture called the *Gift of Prophecy*, as appeareth in the fore-mentioned Texts. If our Answerer can shew a disparity of Reason, he may, I cannot fancy any; by the same reason that *Abilities to Actions* are called *δυναμεις*, by the same reason they may be and are properly called *Gifts*, for what is the English of that Greek word but *Powers or Abilities*: and

it is past all contradiction, that what the Apostle calleth *divinus* [Powers] i Cor. 12. 29. He calls the *Gifts of Healing* in the very next words. *Have all the Gifts of Healing?* What tho these were *Gifts* given at an *extraordinary time*, or in an *extraordinary manner* (which indeed they were) yet I appeal to any indifferently Learned Man, to determine, Whether this alters the *Genus*, or only distributes the *Species*. All Spiritual Abilities are *Gifts*, but they are not all *Saving Gifts*, or *extraordinary Gifts*. And this is enough to vindicate my self from impropriety of Speech.

11. But saith our Author p. 29. That is eminently and especially to be esteemed the *Gift of Prayer*, which disposeth and enableth to the performance of the duty of Prayer (very true, and is not *Vindication* this all I have contended for?) on p. 29. And therefore since Prayer is not so much a verbal thing, as a pious address of the Heart, Soul, and Spirit to God, the Supplies and Assistances of his Grace which kindle and excite pious Dispositions, in seeking unto God, with earnest and affectionate desires, a lively Faith, and the exercise of inward Devotion; this is most properly his vouchsafing and bestowing the *Gift of Prayer*; and our having and exercising them, is our having and using the *Gift of Prayer*.

This now is well laid as to Truth, but not a tittle of it to the purpose: Here is a manifest Transition, from one kind to another.

That a Christian may in his heart Pray, tho his Lips move not, is out of doubt (*Hannah* did so.) But can any Minister discharge his Ministerial Duty in Publick Prayer thus? Nay can a private Christian in his Family, or Closet do it? If not, there is another kind of Prayer besides this, and our Author knew well enough, that it is that we are speaking of. The Question is. What is the Gift of Prayer relating to *Vocal Prayer*? Our Answerer grants, It is that which *enableth and disposeth to the performance of the duty*. Now I appeal again to any one that understandeth sense, Whether those things which the Answerer mentions, inable any person to *Vocal Prayer*, as it stands contradistinguished to *meer heart Prayer*, which is that we are not at all speaking of? It is manifest it is not, for then *no Unbeliever, no Wicked Man, hath any Ability to pray*, and St. Paul had given very impertinent Counsel to the Sorcerer to Pray, that *the thoughts of his heart might be forgiven him*; which it seems he had no Gift, no Ability to do; for it is certain he had *no Faith, nor Pious Affections*. It might have been expected, that he who Faults others for Impropriety of Speech, should himself have spoken *Ad idem* at least, *i. e.* to the thing in Question, which whether he hath done, or no, I leave to any one who understands sense to judge. The Author of the Book he answereth, had often enough told him, that he spake not concerning *Heart Prayer* but *Vocal Prayer*,
that

that Praying wherein in obedience to the command of God, the voice is used, to express the desires of the heart. It is an easie thing to answer at this rate.

12. For what he saith p. 31, 32, 33. in Answer to what the Author had spoken from Zech. 12. 10. Rom. 8. 26. to prove a Gift of Prayer to be a Divine Gift, issueth in this, Whether by the Spirit of Grace and Supplication, and the Spirits helping our Infirmitie in Prayer, be to be understood, as well the Spirits giving us an Ability fitly to express our minds to God in Prayer, as furnishing us with Gracious Habits, disposing us so to Pray as we may find favour with God. It is our Answerers concern to affirm the latter onely: But the Author is of another mind; because he finds in Scripture, Gifts that are not saving, called Spiritual Gifts; 1 Cor. 12. 1. and 1 Cor. 14. 1. and the Manifestations of the Spirit; 1 Cor. 12. 7. where are reckoned the Word of Wisdom, the Word of Knowledge, the Gifts of Healing, Working of Miracles, Prophecy, Tongues; some of which are by the same Apostle determined no saving gifts; 1 Cor. 13. 2, 3. The Author is of the mind that all these are comprehended under the Promises of pouring out of the Spirit, mentioned in the Old Testament, And tho an Ability to Pray be not mentioned in that 1 Cor. 12. 7. yet he never thought to have met with any who regarded what he said, who would have denied, That it is a gift, and

a *Spiritual gift* ; nor doth yet believe it shue out of those Promises, *Zech. 12. 10. Rom 8. 26.* tho not solely, perhaps not Principally intended in them: both which, the Author grants to the *Answerer*, if he can make any Market with them.

13. Our *Answerer* is again at it p 34. *As that Ability of Expression whereby a Man largely professeth the particular Doctrines of the Christian Faith, is not properly the Gift of Faith, of Believing, so neither is the like Ability of expressing the matter of our Prayer to be accounted in any proper sense the Gift of Prayer.* Still we are upon the old fallacy, and whatsoever I Answer, our *Answerer* will avoid us, by telling us he spake of meer *Heart Prayer*, where no words are needful; that is, nothing to the point in Question: Is *Beleeving* a *Vocal Action* think we? Or is it a meer Action of the Heart, and to say an *Ability* fitly to speak, is that *Gift*, were to own my self simple enough: But I hope an *Ability* fitly to speak, is the Gift of *Confession of Faith with our Lipps.* Let our Author speak out and tell us, If a *Praying with our hearts be all the Prayers God requireth of Ministers in their publick Ministrations*: If it be not, he saith nothing to the purpose, for still the *Gift of Prayer* in that sense (and I spake of another) is an *ability fitly to express our Minds to God in Prayer.*

14. But he tells us, *This is but the Gift of Speaking, Utterance, or Elocution,* p. 34.

I have scarce patience for such Assertions: Then every one who hath an Ability to speak, utter, or to speak out, or Oratoriously, hath the Gift of Prayer, which is demonstrably false, and contrary to the experience of every day.

15. But at length our Answerer can find a Gift of Prayer, and with the Spirit; this he saith, was that whereby Christians in the beginning of Christianity, were enabled by the extraordinary Impulses, and immediate Inspiration of the Holy Spirit upon their Minds, so to Pray, either in their own, or other Languages, that those Motions of their Hearts, and inward Desires, and also their Words and Expressions, were the proper, and extraordinary Works and Dictates of the Holy Ghost. Admit this true, what followeth? Then an Ability to Pray is the Gift of Prayer, only given to some in a more extraordinary, to others in a more ordinary way. I freely grant him all he saith, if he doth not say, or by this cunningly go about to persuade people, that now no people have an Ability to express their Minds fitly to God in Prayer; which he must not, because he is so liberal as to grant the contrary p. 40.

16. But he saith these extraordinary Gifts were peculiar to the primitive times; Who denies it? But is there not a more ordinary Gift of Prayer still continuing, and the only question is, Whether this be omitted in the performance of the Act?

17. He tells us p. 36. that those who had

had these extraordinary Gifts, were to use them only so far as was consistent with the rules of Order, Decency, and Edification: Who denieth this too? But these Rules of Order and Decency, were such, as either Nature it self shewed, or the Infallible Spirit, by the Apostles directed; let him prove any thing further if he can, and if he understands no more it is freely granted.

18. As to what he saith in Reply to what I answered to that which he objected from 1 Cor. 14. I know not what his Intentions were, but his words are these, *Libertas Eccles.* p. 120. "The Argument against the lawfulness of set Forms, because they limit the use of Gifts, needeth not much consideration, since it is manifest that by the Will of God, bounds and limits were set, even to the use of extraordinary Gifts of Gods Spirit, that the Church might be edified; 1 Cor. 14. 26, 27, 28, 30, 33.

Could any one make this less than an Argument a *majori ad minus affirmando*, if the greater Gifts might be Limited, then the lesser may. In my Answer, I observed the fallacy might lurk under the term Limited, and distinguished betwixt the Regular use and the Irregular abuse of Gifts, and denied that consequence: That because the Irregular use of Gifts might be restrained, therefore the Regular use of them might. I shall leave the Reader to judg of what I said, and he hath here answered, whether
he

he hath taken off the least of my Answer. Only adding, That an Argument from the Power of the Apostles to the Power of any Superiours now (till the Author hath proved those now impowred, Possessed of the same Infallible Spirit, and of the same Divine Right, to make new Rules of Order for the Church) is very inconclusive.

19. In his 41 p. He tells us that *This faculty of Expression Vindication in Prayer, is procured and enlarged, by men who have a competent Natural freedom of Speech by use, and exercise, and advanced by various Methods. I acknowledge (saith he) that in some an Affectionateness of Devotion, doth contribute much thereto; in others confident self conceit, and an heated fancy, and (as I have read some particular Instances) even Diabolical Contracts, have promoted the same. What he calls facility of Expression, is the same with what I called an ability fitly to express our minds to God in Prayer; and of this he speaks, or he saith nothing to the purpose. This he saith is procured and enlarged by use and exercise (he saith true, provided the Person hath first a due knowledge of God, and of himself, and of the Scriptures; which till one hath acquired, all Use and Exercise is to no purpose.) This also must be supposed to Affectionateness of Devotion, which he (truly) saith contributeth much thereto; but how confident self conceit, a meer heated fancy, or Diabolical Contracts should do it,*
(which

(which the *Answerer* it seems believeth, he would never else have troubled us with a *Romance*) are matters of *wonderful* subtil disquisition, especially that, *How the Devil should help a Man* (if he would be so kind) *fishy to express his mind to God in Prayer*. I tremble while I mention such a thing, as ever spoken by a *Divine*, to help the already too much *Atheistical* and *Blaphemous* World, with an *Authority* (and that no less then *Dr. Faulkners*) to say, *Godly Ministers do that by the Devil, which they do by the assistance of the Holy Spirit of God*. The *Answerers* granting it may be, will be warrant enough to harden hundreds in such *Blasphemies*. How much *Evil speaking* soever I be charged with, I hope I shall avoid that *Evil speaking*, because of those *Texts*, *Mar. 3. 28. 29.* and that *Matth. 12. 31. 32.* The *Crime* there, was the *Pharises* asserting that what *Christ* did, by the *Spirit of God*, v. 28. *Was done by Beelzebub the Prince of Devils*. The *Doctor* doth not indeed boldly assert such a thing but he hath so phrased what he saith, that besides, the *Scurvy Innuendo* in his words, he plainly grants it may be. But surely the *Devil* fills none with the *Knowledge of God*, or with *Affectionate Devotion*. Now whether the *Pharises* guilt there, were not an intulung the *Devil* to the *Operations* of the *Blessed Spirit*, I leave to his serious thoughts. Nor can I be so uncharitable even to the *Pharises*, as to think, that they in saying so,

Lied

Lied against the Holy Ghost, speaking what they knew to be otherwise: I do judge, they thought as they spake, which if they did, I know no difference in the case, but in the means of Conviction they had further, then any can now have, that the People of God Praying in the use of their Spiritual Gifts, Act by the Spirit, because of the *Miracles* they saw wrought by Christ; which indeed was a great means: but the judgment of a true *Miracle* from the *Phænomenon* of it, in one of *Satan's* lying Wonders mentioned 1 *Thessa.* 2. 9. is so difficult, that I cannot see the height of their guilt lay there so much, as in their speaking *Evil* (with reference to the blessed Spirit) in a thing which they knew not, but had good Evidence to the contrary: I pray God that it may not be laid to the charge of so Worthy a Person, that by this unaccountable Suggestion *He hath* (as *David* was charged in a case wherein the Holy Spirit was not so immediately concerned, 2 *Sam.* 12. 14.) made the Enemies of God to Blaspheme. That to Pray in the Spirit, or with the Assistance of the Spirit, is to perform the duty of Prayer, with a pious mind (as he tells us so many times over (Δις τῷ πνεύματι καὶ λόγῳ) is what none denies, but that this is the whole of it, that it is not also with such words as the Spirit teacheth them to utter, which Spirit is therefore called the Spirit of Supplication, the Spirit of Adoption, sent into our hearts;
by

by which a Child of God crieth *Abba Father*, is what the Dr. neither hath proved nor ever can.

20. He tells us p. 43. that he acknowledgeth a sober and due freedom of Expression to be a Gift of God, in the same manner that the capacities of Mens Understandings, and all other Abilities of Mind and Body, are Gods Gifts: But it is plain, this liberty of Expression is the product of the Natural Capacities Men receive from God, which are improved in well disposed Persons by ordinary means under Gods Blessing, &c. Socinus in his Dialogue of Justification, saith the same of Faith (a Spiritual Gift of a more Salvifick Nature) Faith (saith he) is such a Gift of God as God gives to all, and a little before, Hearing is the Gift of God, &c. I do not compare Faith and the Gift of Prayer. I know Faith is a far more excellent gift: But I believe he speaks as much truth, with reference to Faith, as our Answerer speaks as to an Ability to express our minds fully, to God in Prayer; for Faith in the exercise, is the exercise of the Natural Capacity of a Soul, to put a confidence in a person, or Assent to a Proposition which is evidenced to it to be truth; and every man hath a Natural Power to Assent and Rely on proper Objects: But to Assent to a Spiritual Truth above the Evidence of Sense and Reason, to receive Christ and Rely on him for Life Eternal, these are no Natural Capacities: So to speak,
is

is but a *Natural Capacity*. the generality of Men have a *Natural Capacity* to express their Minds, by Speech, but an *Ability* *fitly to express our Minds to God in Prayer*, is no product of a *meer Natural Capacity*, but of the *Spirit of God*, having first enlightened the Soul with the knowledge of God.

21. If he saith it is but such a Gift as Men may have, and Perish eternally, it is granted him; but such were *Prophecy*, the *Mysteries of Knowledge*, *Miraculous Faith*; *Rom. 13. 1, 2.* Yet I hope they were *Spiritual gifts*, and not the meet products of *Natural Capacities*, and different from such *Natural Abilities* as are necessary to make a Man perfect in *Naturalibus*; and it is easie to prove, that *common gifts* in the Service of God are of use and means to *Spiritual Acts*. I know none that ever called the Gift of Prayer a *Spiritual saving Gift*, nor is that any part of the *Question*, but whether it be a *Spiritual Gift*? Yea in *meer Natural gifts*, the neglect cannot be dispensed with, when the *Act* to which they have a Relation, cannot be performed without the use of them. The *Question* is, Whether the Gift of Prayer be not a *mean* in order to the *Act of Prayer*, and if it be so, and given of God for that end, whether in the performance of the *Act* it can be omitted *Lamfully*, and the *Act* performed, by a mean which is neither *Natural*, nor under
any

any Divine Prescript? And to this I find the Author as yet speaking very little.

22. In his next Paragraph, p. 44. he tells us, *That it is a considerable Objection against the necessity contended for, of a Ministers using a particular Gift or Ability, meerly because it is a Gift, in that this would equally make it his duty to use his present or extempore Ability of Conception and Expression in Prayer, or Preaching. — And the use of his Memory in declaring what he hath conceived, or thought on before, and also his Reading, what hath been before Composed by himself or others. — But the use of all these is an impossibility.* None contends for the necessity of using a Gift, because it is a Gift, but because it is a means bestowed upon him by God for this purpose, that by the use of it, he should perform such an Act; but tis most extravagant concluding, that because in the performance of an Religious Action, a Man is tyed to the use of such a Gift, as is a proper mean in order to the performance of such an Act, and given him of God purposely for that end; therefore he is tyed to make use of all his Gifts in such an Act, which are no means, or no direct and proximate means to the performance of that Act. There is no Gift but this Ability we speak of, that hath any direct and present influence upon the Act: I mean no common Gift, Gracious Habits are of another Nature.

23. The Authors next Argument is weaker, For how doth it follow, that because a Minister is bound in Prayer to use the Ability which God hath given him *fitly to express himself in Prayer*, therefore he is bound to do it *in any language* he pleaseth, directly contrary to another Rule of the Apostles, which obligeth him to have respect to the Peoples understanding; or in *many Languages at one time*: but this is all our Author saith p. 41. n. 17. Who seeth not through these Cobwebs? Doth an Obligation to use a Gift in a Religious Act, proper to it, and given of God for that end solely, oblige us also to the use of other Gifts not proper to the Act, nor given us of God solely for that end? Or doth an Obligation to use our Ability fitly to express our selves to God in Prayer, infer an Obligation to do it so many ways as we can do it? I see there is some need of Arguing Syllogistically, which if we had done, we had avoided these Impertinencies.

24. And it is every whit to as good purpose, that our Answerer tells us, We may omit our Gifts in Criticizing, in Expounding Scripture, or of Fathoming deep Controversies, in our Popular Sermons. p. 46.

When the Answerer hath proved, That Critical expounding of a Text, or resolving deep Controversies, are Acts of a Gospel Ministers Ministry towards his People, who

E

understand

understand little or nothing of such things, then I shall consider what he hath said; for he may remember that my Argument was limited to *Publick Ministerial Acts*, which are parts of the *Worship of God*; as to which these Instances are apparently Impertinent. It will be proper to bring such Instances as these, when he finds me making such a Proposition as this:

If a Man cannot without sin omit, the use of his Gifts, in his Ministerial Acts of Worship: Then it is Sin for him to omit it, in his Scholastical Acts, or any other Acts of his Life.

25. Of the same nature are his Instances of *Private Abilities*, to Interpret the *Scriptures out of the Original*, to make *Confession of Faith and Creeds*. Are any of these ordinary *Ministerial Acts*? Or *Acts of Worship*, which are the Duties of every Minister? If they be, let our *Answerer* shew us their Establishment in the Word of God (for there all *Acts of Worship* must have their Establishment, or lose their name, and so I think all *Protestants* agree) if he cannot make this appear he hath not spoken any thing to the purpose, but proceeds *Ex Ignoracione Elenchi*; p. 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, and 56. We acknowledge that the *Version of the Scriptures* must proceed from *an ability to do it*, and such an *Ability*, as stands in need of Gods great Assistance; but we say it is no *Ministerial Duty*, no work that God hath

hath intrusted to ordinary Ministers, no Act of Worship, &c. The Apostles Practice proves this, who made no *New Versions* themselves, nor gave any *Ministers* such a thing in charge; but enough was spoken to this in the Book our *Answerer* answereth, and much more than he is pleased to take notice of. Let the Reader but consult the *Reasonable Account*, p. 19, 20. for *Creeds*, and *Confessions of Faith*, the case is the same; they are *Good and Prudential things*, and the *Duties* of all *Ministers* to give, when they are required: But are these *Acts of Worship*? and to be performed, by any Divine Law, when ever any Congregation meets to Worship God? They may be made then, because they are *Modes of Teaching and Instructing*, and so fall under the general precept of *Teaching*. But what are any of these to the Question? Which is stated concerning the *Ministers Duty* in their *Publick, Solemn, Ministerial Acts of Worship*? Before our *Answerer* undertook his work in answering, he was at liberty whether he would meddle with the *Reasonable Account* or no. But when he had undertaken the *Vindication of Liturgies* from what is there said, he ought certainly to have spoken to the Question, as the Author had stated it, p. 5. especially considering he did the Author the Honour to say he had done it, with *sufficient clearness and plainness*: Then surely the Author of the *Vindication*, ought

either to have let it alone , or to have spoken to it, as it was *sufficiently, clearly, and plainly* stated.

26. He telleth us 55. p. that in *Publick Prayer* (I have nothing to do with what he saith of *Versions of the Scripture*, and *Declarations of the Articles of Faith*, which he joyns with it, they were both Excluded the Question, as I stated it) but in *Publick Prayer*, it may well be presumed that what is well considered and settled, or prescribed as a form, is more perfect and compleat, in the compassure, than can be expected, in any method of ordinary variation; and to assert that these things may be always better, or as well performed, and composed, by every Minister, or even by the most Eminent Person, whomsoever, in a constant way of varying in the use of their own Abilities, then in well considered and digested Forms, is as much as to affirm, that the varied Expressions of Men at every particular time, are more proper, pithy, and expressive, and full, then the best composed Prayer, that is at any time made, and reviewed, with the greatest consideration and care; for so it may be expected, that a publicly established Form is.

This is now a fine flourish, and harangue of words, but that is all; for if he meaneth it concerning our own *Liturgy*, what might have been expected I will not say; but if our *Author* inquireth, whether any one part of it, were so much as once read over by the *House of Commons* (and being

being now part of an *Act*, many think it should have been by the Law of *England*, all read over thrice) and when it was read over in the *House of Lords*, what a mistake was found in it by their *Lordships*, will see no reason to *presume*, that it was by our *Ecclesiastical Superiours* (who yet without a *Parliament*, are not our *Superiours*, in the point of Legal Establishments) reviewed with the *greatest Care and Consideration*. 2. If it were so, surely the *Nonconformists-Advertaries*, would not all this time have only contended that there were no Phrases in it but might *Lawfully* be used, but they would have pleaded, *That there could no better Forms be composed, or used*; which I do not know that any of them hath gone about to demonstrate. What in a *Legal Establishment*, is not once reviewed, by one part of the *Legislative* power in any place, cannot certainly be said to be reviewed, with the *greatest Consideration*, and *Care*, tho possibly it might be by some said to be reviewed with a *sufficient Consideration*; as to which I say nothing, but cannot allow *Superlatives* in the case. 3. This very Argument will conclude for *Forms of Preaching*, every whit as much as for *Forms of Prayer*. But I shall give a strict Answer to it.

27. In the *Sacred Worship of God that is best, which God hath prescribed and directed*. In the cleansing of the *Lepers*, *Levit. 14.* the poor mans *Two Turtle Doves*, or *two*

young Pidgeons, such as he was able to get, v. 22. was (though of far less intrinsic value) yet every whit as good, as the Rich Mans Lamb, mentioned v. 12, 13, &c. and therefore when the Question is, *What is the Will of God in the case*, all these discourses which is *best* or *worst* in *Humane Eyes*, or according to *Humane valuations*, are woful Impertinencies: *That is best*, which it is the *Will of God we should use or do*. Nor is *Superiours Establishment*, any evidence in which my Soul ought to rest without further enquiry to guide my Practice. who am to search the Scriptures, after St. Paul hath preached, *Acts 17.* That *what is Established is the Will of God in the Case*, if it were true, instead of proving *all things*, that I might hold fast that which is good, I should prove nothing: but presume it best because *Superiors* have established it. This is the very thing that *Eccius* the Popish Lawyer replied to *Luther* at the *Diet of Worms Ann. 1621.*

Neque tuum est ea quæ Conciliorum auctoritate sunt olim definita rursus in questionem aut dubium vocare. Sleidan. de Statu Religionis, &c. l. 3.

What is the English of that but this, *That is best which your Superiours have determined*; and how far such a Notion is improveable to the ruin of *all true Religion*, appears by the *Council* to which *Eccius* related; which consisted of as vile a
pack

pack of Men, as ever met in Council: For it was the Council of *Constance*, which determined the Pope above all Councils, contrary to the Council at *Basil* just before; and in conformity to the *Faction* Council of *Pisa*, Assembled by *Julius 2.* to confront another Council sitting. it was that Council (of *Constance*, I mean) that burnt *John Huss* and *Hierome of Prague*, who had both the Popes and Emperours security, for safe coming, and returning, and established another Cursed Doctrine of Popery, *That Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks.* In this case before us, the difference betwixt us and our Adversaries (for I see I must call Brethren no more) lies here. We say, *That is best in the Worship of God, which appeareth to be the Will of God;* and what as to our own practice, so appeareth unto us, is best unto us. Our Adversaries say, *That is best which hath a Legal Establishment, and as to your Practice ought to be presumed best, tho you do judge the quite contrary, from Arguments which appear to you very probable; and you cannot answer:* So in short our contest is for no less, then the *Foundation of the Reformed Religion.* But it may be this *Harangue* of our Answerer, did not come in, because he thought it pertinent, but to give him an opportunity to lash him, whom he had to deal with; which is the next thing he attempts, but never toucheth him.

28. He goes on: "And he who talketh

“ of this our Church, That if all her Ministers
 “ cannot constantly in their daily Prayers
 “ equal or outdo the perfection or exactness
 “ of a well considered Form (for this must
 “ be his Sense, if he speaketh to any purpose)
 “ that this may be spoken to the shame of the
 “ Church of God in *England*: These raw and
 “ extravagant speeches will be to the shame
 “ of those that utter them, so far as they will
 “ be ashamed of uncharitable and reproachful
 “ calumnies against the Church of God, and
 “ of speaking against all Sense and Reason.

When I read this, I wondered who he
 meant, till I saw in the *Margent* the Book
 quoted which he pretends to answer, p. 157.
 there I find in answer to the Vindicators
 arguing the *Necessity of Liturgies*, “ That
 “ needful and comprehensive Petitions for all
 “ Common and Ordinary, Spiritual and
 “ outward wants, of our selves and others, with
 “ fit Thanksgivings; may not in the publick
 “ Supplications of the Church be omitted; which
 “ considering men as they are, can no other way
 “ be so well or at all assured. That the Author
 of that Book had said,

“ Let it be spoken to the shame of the
 “ Church of God in *England*, and it shall be
 “ for a Lamentation in it, if in a Church
 “ (whose Territories are so large) there can-
 “ not be found persons enough sufficient
 “ without others prescriptions to them, to put
 “ up needful comprehensive Petitions, not only
 “ for common and ordinary, but for the
 “ Emergent and Extraordinary Spiritual and

“ ou

“outward wants of any persons with fit
“thanksgivings.

What makes the man in such a passion for this?--- Here is not a word of *all Ministers being able to equal and outdo the Perfection and Exactness of a well considered Form*, (but this he saith, must be his sense, or he speaks to no purpose) *E Cathedra dictum*.

1. But in cool blood (when men are least subject to let their tongue outrun their reason) was the Author bound to say more in his Answer than his Objector had said in his *Objection*? The *Objector* had not in his *Objection* said, *That all Ministers might put up Prayers in the greatest Perfection of Phrase or Manner or Style and Exactness*, he onely spake of *needful Petitions*, that should comprehend all *Common and Ordinary*, *Spiritual, and outward wants*. 2. There is no need, nor doth God any where require, that all his Ministers should pray with the *greatest perfection and exactness*, but that they should do the best they are able to do, according to the best abilities God hath given them. 3. Doth the Author say, or was it the *Vindicator*, that suggested, that all Ministers are not able to do this; I think it was the *Vindicator*, who upon this Argument pleaded the necessity of *Others Prescriptions*. 4. The Author indeed did say, *If it were so, it was a shame to* No B. he had said *the Church of God in England; the same the Rea-* he saith so still, for no such *sonable Account*; p. Ministers are able to preach *1 c a.* without such *Prescriptions*. 5. But to reconcile him-

himself to the *Vindicator*, he doth from his heart believe that in the Church of England there are *twice ten thousand men* (which is as many again as there are acting Ministers) who *without others Prescriptions*, are able to put up needful and comprehensive Petitions, for all Common, and Ordinary, Spiritual and Outward Wants, of themselves and others, with fit Thanksgivings. Yea and something more than this, for all Emergent Occasions, as to which Forms cannot provide; which it may be is the reason that it will be hard to prove, that such Petitions, and fit Thanksgivings, have not Universally been put up with reference to the late *Horid Popish Plot*, and most Eminent dangers of the Nation, as every good English mans common reason, may have judged needful. 6. From hence appears, that tho he be first *Impeaching*, yet it is not the *Author*, but the *Answerer*, who in the place quoted, hath *Calumniated* and *Reproached* the Church of God, and spoken *rawly* and *extravagantly*: The *Vindicator* plainly asserted the necessity of *Liturgies*, because there were not in the Church persons so able. The *Author* saith no such thing, but saith, It is a shame for us, if there be not; in the mean time believing there are so many, either actually imployed in the Ministry, or who may be so, when they please *Bar, Ut canem cædas facile est invenire baculum.*

29. All this while it seems the *Vindicator* hath said nothing to the *Authors Argument*. The great thing which seems to be the Question betwixt us in all this Discourse, is, *Whether there*

there be any such thing the duty of Ministers as Verbal Prayer, or whether words have any necessary concern in Ministers Publick Prayers, since Prayer is not so much a Verbal thing saith he; p. 30. But is it not a Duty that cannot by a Minister be publickly performed without words: if not, by his leave words are essential to it (for certainly that is essential to a thing without which that thing cannot be.) He cometh now to the Authors Argument, after 26 pages spent in Prologomena. The first thing, which he saith p. 57. hath been before spoken to in the beginning of this Chapter, when I did not think fit to have spoken any thing to his long digression, tho afterwards I saw it necessary to make good my Minor Proposition.

30. The second thing, he saith is p. 58. "That Ability of Expression is not peculiarly and particularly given by God to Ministers, that they might thereby perform the publick Office of Prayer. This he would prove, Because it is given to others beside Ministers — Because then our Lord would not have given his Disciples a Form of Prayer: — But is this the Question? I assume no more, then that it is a *Meau* given by God in order to the performance of the act, natural and proper. What if it be given to others as well as Ministers? then they are also bound to perform the Act in the use of it: The giving of it to others as well as Ministers, surely doth not make it cease to be a Gift, a Ministerial Gift, a Gift in order to the Act; which is all I have said. And *Dato non concessio*, supposing our Saviour did give his Disciples the

Lords

Lords Prayer for a *Form of words*, doth it follow this is not a *Divine Mean* natural and proper, because that (altho not so Natural) yet it is as *Divine* and *Proper*, being appointed by him who is *God over all, blessed for ever*; or that because we may doubtless use any *Mean of Divine Institution*, therefore we may neglect a *Mean* given us of *God*, and use a *Mean* under no *Divine Prescription*? Certainly it will not follow, that because a *Form* Composed, and Instituted by *Christ*, is a *Divine Mean*, therefore *Forms Instituted by men*, are; till *Christs Commission* to them to do as much in his Church in this case as himself, be well proved. I leave this Answer to any fair intelligent *Reader's Judgment*, whether it be adequate or no?

31. In the next place he tells us the *Authority of Governours* is of considerable weight: Indeed it is, but not in this case, because i cannot be pleaded without begging the *Question*, as may be seen by the clear and plain stating of it p. 5. and certainly, the answering of an Argument by a plain and open begging the *Question*, speaks the *Vindicator* to be as *Defective* in his *Logick*, as the *Author* was supposed to be in his *Chronological learning*.

32. He tells us p. 60. That the *Author* saith, *That a mans own Gift and Ability is a Divine Mean*. He doth so, and it is true. But a *Form of Prayer* is a meer humane *Mean*. A *Form of Prayer* prescribed or composed by others, to be used by me, if those others were
not

not authorized by God, is but an *Humane Mean*; nor is it possible that it should be other.— Now (he saith) “*this must be upon a Supposition that an ability to compose a Prayer, to speak it, is a Divine Ability*; (he should have said *Mean*.) *but the same ability, to compose the same Prayer if it be written, is a meer Humane Mean* (for so he should have said if he intended to speak Sense, as every Reader will own.) An Ability to express our minds fitly in Prayer to God, is a *Divine Mean* relating to the Action of Praying. An *Ability fitly to express the matter or stile of a Prayer in a Book*, is also a *Divine Mean*, in order to the action of writing such a Form. But how doth it appear that another Mans Ability, fitly to express the matter or stile of a Prayer in a Book, is also a *Divine Mean* in order to my *Action in Prayer*? He that can prove this, must use another *Medium*, or else assert, That what is a *Divine Mean* for *A. B.* as to one *Action*, is also a *Divine Mean* for *C. D.* as to another *Action* of a quite differing *Species*. This is now what *Logicians* call *Ignoratio Elenchi*. What he saith p. 60, and 61. in his 36 Paragraph, is much of the same strength. The *Author* did say, That if none have an *Ability to express their own and others Minds fitly to God in Prayer*, then no Man hath an *Ability to make publick Forms*; for in them there must be such an *Ability exercised*. What doth our Answerer conclude from
hence?

hence? Then, *The Ability to make Liturgies is the Gift of Prayer, and consequently must be a Divine Mean for the performance of Prayer: How doth this follow? It will follow indeed, that it is a Divine Mean, for the composition of a Prayer, but not for the Action of Prayer; because it is not the ability of him that prayeth, but of other Men, whom God never employed (so far as we yet see proved) to find out means for others Actions in his Worship. But I am not difficult to grant, That an Ability to make Forms of Prayer is a Divine Mean for some persons, viz. such as have not attained to an Ability of themselves, fitly to express their mind to God: but will it therefore follow, that it is so for them, to whom God hath given another mean, more proper and natural?*

33. The Answerer p. 61. comes to answer my Proofs, which were drawn from those Texts, where Ministers are from God commanded, not to neglect their Gifts, 1 Tim. 4. 14. 1 Pet. 4. 10, 11. Rom. 12. 3, 6. As to the first Text, he tells us, 1. That it was a charge not to neglect his Office. 2. That there is not a word spoken of Prayer. To which I reply, 1. That *χρησμεν*, which in many other places signifies a Gift, or Ability to a Religious Act, in this place signifies an Office and not a Gift, is spoken without any proof. 2. That both the words before-going, *Give Attendance to Reading, to Exhortation, Doctrine, —*
and

and those immediately following: *Meditate on these things, give thy self wholly to them*, — *Take heed to thy self and to thy Doctrine*, are vehement Presumptions to the contrary.

3. I will not deny but it may signifie both *Gift*, and *Office*, if that will please our *Answerer*, and that it doth signifie both is plain from 20 Texts in the *New Testament*. But it seems that it will not, for he goes on and tells us there is not a *Word* about *Prayer*: Who said there was? I onely urged it as a general *Prohibition* of the neglect of any *Ministerial Gifts*, of which surely the *Gift of Prayer* is one. The Argument is, *Ministers must neglect no Ministerial Gift*: Therefore not that of *Prayer*. But he saith, *The Gift of Prayer is not given by the laying on of hands*, nor doth the Text say so; it saith, *By Prophecy with the laying on of hands*. By *Prophecy*, that is, that you might prophecy (so *Piscator*, *Vatablus*, and *Beza* render it) or *with Prophecy*, so the *Syriack*, *Arabick* and *Aethiopick* Versions expound it, or by *Prophecy*, so the *Vulgar Latine* and our *Translation*, which is hardest to expound, unless (as some) we will expound it *per oraculum*, immediately from God. With *Impositions of hands*, that is with the *Office* of the *Ministry*, in which sense *χερσιν* here cannot signifie the *Office*, but the *Gift*. But besides, may not, are not *Ministerial Gifts* in a more plentiful measure given at the time, vvhhen God calls a man out to the *Publick Ministry*,

I am Sure the Scripture tells us, of another Spirit, given to Persons at their calling out to Places of Magistracy. I believe the same as to the Ministry. But our Answerer saith it might be meant of *Extraordinary Gifts*, which might not be neglected. May then Ordinary Gifts be neglected? And is not this an Infallible Answer as to anything we can produce of this Nature? It is but saying, *Those Texts refer to the extraordinary Gifts*, tho no pretence can be brought of proof for it.

Our *Vindicator* p. 63, seems again a little displeased, *That I should bring a Text to prove an obligation, as to the manner of Performance of Prayer, in which there is no mention of Prayer*; who p. 142. cryed out upon it as *Ridiculous* for another to argue from *Rom. 15. 16.* Because the Apostle praying for like-mindedness, prayed, *That with one mouth they might glorifie God*, he might have told the Reader also, that in that place, I fairly stated the Argument which could be drawn from that Text, thus:

Those who are to speak the same thing, and are with one mouth to glorifie God; may lawfully, or must use set Forms of Prayer.

But Christians are to speak the same thing, 1 Cor. 1. 10. and with one mouth to glorifie God — Ergo — If our Vindicator can make more of it, why doth he not.

I denied the Major, d him, the
and tol same

same Argument would prove, *Forms of Preaching* necessary, and the *same Forms* to be used in all *Churches, Families and Closets*; yea and that it was necessary for all Christians to speak the same words in all Religious Discourse, *but then I should not have used the same Logick.* It is true none ought to do that himself, which he disalloweth in another: But have I done it? Let us try. My Argument from that Text, 1 Tim.

4. 14. lies thus,

Those who ought not in their Ministry, to neglect their Ministerial Gift, ought not to neglect their Gift of Prayer.

But Ministers in their Ministry in Prayer, ought not to neglect their Ministerial Gift, 1 Tim. 4. 14. — Ergo.

I think this Arguing is according to an old Rule in Logick, *Quicquid prædicatur de genere prædicatur etiam de specie.* Let but our *Vindicator* prove, That Ministers all Praying by one and the same Form of Words, is a Species to Glorifying God with one Mouth, as I will prove that Gifts of Prayer are Species of Ministerial Gifts: and he will say something: otherwise this is nothing but an ugly Reflexion, of which his Book is too full.

What his quotation from *Grotius* means, I cannot tell: He was no Father, no Divine, but a Learned Politician, very Erroneous in his Divinity; of what Authority his Sentiment should be with any sober Divine, I cannot imagine.

35. He comes p. 64. to my Quotation of I Pet. 4. 10. in the case, *as every one hath received the Gift, so let him minister the same τὸ αὐτὸ* The same, what? The same Gift. As to this he saith, Many understand that Text of *Alms*; and why? Because the verse before spake of *Hospitality*. Why may not others understand it of *Spiritual Gifts*, considering that the following words are, *As Stewards of the Manifest Grace of God, χαρίσιν* (is that *Alms*) *If any man speak, let him speak as the Oracles of God.* Then he refers us to the second and third Answer which he gave to the aforementioned Text, that is, *by Gift may be meant Office*; but whether is more proper to say, *Men minister their Office*, or *their Gifts* in their Offices? But (which was his third Answer) it might be understood of *extraordinary Gifts*. Then this Text now signifies nothing of Duty to us, thus any thing may be avoided, nor is there the least shadow of Reason for what he saith. Yes, saith he, he speaks of *ministring one to another*; now he that prayeth *ministreth only to God*. He speaketh of *Officers* in the Church *ministring*, now surely they in Prayer, Minister not to God only, but to the Church, or else the Church and they pray diverse things.

36. He comes to answer what I urged from Rom. 12. 6. *Having Gifts given according to the Grace given us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion*

Portion of Faith, or Ministry, let us wait on our ministry; or he that teacheth on Teaching, or he that exhorteth on Exhortation. He that giveth, let him do it with Simplicity, he that Ruleth, with Diligence, he that sheweth Mercy, with Chearfulness.

As to this he only referreth to his former Answer to 1 Pet. 4. 10. and tells us there is no mention of Prayer there, but the other gifts which the Apostle meaneth are there named. Let me a little enlarge on this Theme, because it will give some light to that text, 1 Tim. 4. 14.

The Apostle is plainly there speaking of the *Whole Church Service*, which he distinguisheth into *Prophecy* and *Ministry*. Ministry distinguisheth it into the *Ministry* of him that giveth or sheweth Mercy (which is that of *Deacons*) or *Ruling*; under *Prophecy* he comprehendeth all other Acts of a Gospel Minister: for though *Prophets* and *Prophecy*, in the New Testament sometime signify persons or acts, predicting things to come, as it is used with reference to *Agabus*, Acts 21. sometimes some Acts which were the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost, as is in some places in 1 Cor. 12. 13. 14. yet it also signifies the *Ordinary Ministry* of all those who had something to do, besides *Ruling* and *shewing Mercy*. These we call *Ministers* (tho the Apostle speaks otherwise in this Text, to distinguish them from *Deacons*, and meer *Rulers*; and therefore calls their whole *Ministration Prophecy*.) That

precept, *1 Theff. 5. 20. Despise not Prophecying*, is not to be restrained to *Prædictions*, or *immediate Revelations*, but comprehends all *Gospel Ministrations* of the Ordinances of Christ, tho expressed by one of the Eminentest among them, which is Preaching the Gospel. Now as to these the Apostle saith, *Having Gifts let us Minister. Being in these Offices, let us Minister, κατὰ τὴν χάριν*, according to the grace of God given to us; that is, according to that *Ability which God hath given us*. I Appeal to any thinking Reader, whether this bids not very fair for the true and plain sense of that Text; which if it doth, 1. Prayer is there spoken to, included in the general term *Prophecying*, tho no more particularly named, then *Baptizing*, or *Giving the Lords Supper*, or *Visiting the Sick*, &c. 2. If that difficult Phrase, *1 Tim. 4. 14. be not to be understood, By Prophecy*, that is by God who is the Author of Prophecy, but *To, or for Prophecy* (according to *Vatablus*, *Piscator*, and *Beza*) a very fair Sense may be put on that Text, without restraining it (most unreasonably) to the *Extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit*.

37. The Answerer saying no more, to deliver these Texts out of my hands, cometh p. 67, &c. to except against my description of the Gift of Prayer for the publick Service of the Church, as very defective especially in two things. My Description was, *An Ability to express our Minds fully to God*

God in Prayer. 1. He saith the *Conceptions of the Ministers mind, must be sober, well ordered, comprehensive, suitable to the Nature of the Duty.* Is not all this comprehended in *Fifty*? To what purpose so many words? I never loved *long Descriptions.* 2. He tells me the Minister is not to *express his mind, his desires or wants*, but (the Mind he should have said) *the wants of the whole Assembly.* I would gladly know how he should know the *Wants and Regular desires of the whole Assembly*, but from the *Scriptures*; and whether their *ordinary wants be not his also*? For *emergent wants*, how they who made Forms 100 Years ago could know the *Wants and Desires* of the several Assemblies of Christians at this day, more than the Ministers now living and conversing with them, and whether this be in the least probable (if God or Christ, who did know all things past, present, and to come, did not draw those Forms) I am not able to conceive.

38. Another place he must except to, that is, p. 9, 10. and put a Marginal Note upon it too: that is this, I said, *We thought it would be hard to find Nine or Ten thousand Schollars in England, furnished with the Gift of Praying or Preaching, in any tolerable manner.* Is not this one of their own Arguments for the necessity of Forms of Prayer? I have read and heard it forty times from them: I hope he will now be reconciled to me, who have told him, and

do from my heart believe it, that there are twice Ten thousand Persons in England, who either are, or might be Ministers, who have the *Gift of Prayer*. He might before have been Friends with me, if he had pleased, for I find I had told him so before, *Reasonable Account*, p. 154.

C H A P. III.

An Answer to what the Vindicator saith in his Third Chapter; beginning at p. 73. Whether any can with equal Attention of his Mind, read in a Book, as speak the Conceptions of his own Heart? Whether Ministers can by Forms Pray with equal Fervency and Devotion? The contrary proved. The People not so much concerned in it, &c.

I. **T**HE Argument which our *Answerer* comes to answer in this Chapter was falsely Printed, and I thank him for not imputing the Error of the Printer to me, who saw not the Book till it was too late, to *Correct* any thing in it. I shall therefore transcribe and amend it here: It lyeth thus:

"To use such a mode in the ordinary performance

"formance of our duty, in publick Solemn
 "Prayer, as either from the necessary work-
 "ings of Humane Nature, or otherwise upon
 "experience we find, either hindring the Atten-
 "tion of our own or others thoughts to the duty, or
 "the Intention of our own or others Spirits, in
 "the performance of the duty, when we can so
 "perform it, as neither of them will be to that
 "degree hindred, is unlawful.

"But for him who hath the Gift of Prayer
 "[I now expound that term, by an Abi-
 "lity fitly to express his Mind to God in
 "Prayer] to perform his Ministerial Acts, in
 "Publick Solemn Prayer, by the Prescribed
 "Forms of other Men, not divinely inspired,
 "(these words were left out) is for him to use
 "such a mode in those Acts of Worship, as ei-
 "ther from the Natural workings of Humane
 "Nature or from some other cause scarce a-
 "voidable, is upon experience found, to hin-
 "der our own Attention, and also the Atten-
 "tion of others thoughts to the duty, and the
 "intention and fervency of our own and others
 "Spirits in the duty, when in the mean time we
 "have an Ability so to perform it, as neither of
 "them will (at least) to that degree be hindred.
 Ergo.

All the question here lieth upon the Mi-
 nor. The Answerer very honestly grants
 the Major, he only saith there may be too
 great stress laid upon Zeal and Fervency, but
 I hope not upon Holy Zeal; if he looks back,
 he will find himself acknowledging that
 which I said p. 43.

2. In his 75 p. he seems to fault my leaving *Arguments*, and propounding three questions. He hath no reason to be displeased at that, considering he told us in his *Introduction*, that *it was acceptable to few but those who admired the Art of making Syllogisms*. And tho I judg'd a *Prosyllogism*, containing the head of an *Argument*, very reasonable, to keep those that argue within their bounds; yet in a Book, I never thought following discourse reasonable to be tyed to those Forms My first question was:

Whether it be possible for any to read any discourse with that degree of Attention of thoughts as he must pronounce the same with by heart? It is manifest this Question was stated only with reference to the Attention of him that ministrereth in the duty.

Our Answerer replies, *It is certain this may easily be done*. I am clearly of another mind, considering, 1. *That there is not a wilder thing*, then *Mans imaginative power*; nor *its wildness at any time more seen*, then in *Holy Duties*. Who is able to keep his thoughts fixed upon God, and the matter of his Supplications for one quarter of an hour in Prayer? The Lord Pardon me, I

cannot. 2. While I am Reading by the help of my Eye, my thoughts are more at liberty to wander from what I am about, then while I am speaking, from the Conceptions of my own Heart.

Why a Man cannot read any thing with like Attention of thoughts, as he may speak it by heart from his own Conceptions.

Heart. I have an Eye to see, and a Tongue to speak, let my thoughts be where they will, as to the main Operations of them, after an habit of Reading once acquired, they have no great business to do to help me to *read right*. It is no great business for me to think how to sound those Letters which my Eyes have before them. But while I speak from my own Conceptions, my thoughts must attend my Tongue, or I shall speak nothing but *Nonsense*. This I did say, and do say, is to me next to a *Demonstration*, onely I crave leave to make one term in the *Question* plainer [*by heart.*] I meant, by it from the *Conceptions of his own heart*; and so let it stand or fall, by any discreet Judgment.

3. But saith our *Answerer*, *How usual is it to read the Scriptures and other Books, with as great Attention as the same things can be spoken without Reading? Attention to what? To the matter he readeth?* I do doubt that. I am sure a Mans thoughts in such Services are most inclinable to wander, and be employed about other things, and I am sure they are more at liberty to wander. Now considering both these things, this *possibility* is (considering our imperfect state) very questionable; yet will it not follow that then we must not read the Scriptures, but always recite them by heart, because God hath made *Reading of them our Duty*. As to this Question let all truly speak as they find, I own the wildness of my heart in this thing.

4. Our

4. Our Answerer, p. 77, 78. comes to the Second Question which I propounded. *Whether any thing can more conduce to fix the thoughts upon the Duty and upon God, then when a man can trust his Affections, to thrust out words?*

Our Answerer saith, *That a Devout Sense of Gods presence and of his Purity, &c. may,* but he never considered that all these were pre-necessary to *Pious Affections*, and without these the *Affections* are not rightly ordered for the duty. The Question was, *Whether the Affections* being rightly disposed, their thrusting out words did not more conduce, then any Form made by Men could, to fix the thoughts? Dr. Ames was of the opinion it did; *De Casibus Consc.* l. 4. 17. cap. qu. 4. the learned Author of *Altare Damasc.* is of that mind; in short I never met with any that denied it; of necessity it must be so, for there is no *Medium* betwixt such *Affections* and such words to divert or give scope of devagation to the thoughts. For our Saviours repeating the same words in his Prayers upon his Agony, neither is it so in the *Greek*, neither are the words the same; but for this I refer the Reader to a *Supplement to the Reasonable Account*, where this silly Argument is fully spoken to p. 99. 100, 101, 102, 103, 104.

5. The third Question which I propounded was,

Whether any such Attention, is to be expected from people to Forms of Prayer, which they often hear, as to a conceived Prayer? The

The *Author* thinks it may be given to the matter of the Prayer : I think so too, there is no impossibility in the case I know of. But the Question was, *Whether it be to be expected, or hoped for, considering the infirmity of all our natures?* This he wisely leaveth out, and as wisely replieth nothing to the true Question.

6. For what our *Author* adds in answer to an observation which I called at least *ingenious*, tho none of my own ; *That God to stir up peoples Attentions*, tells his people he will *do a new thing*, he may find

Besides *Is. 42. 9.* it *Isaiah 42. 9. 43. 19.* it is this that the Scripture calls *Admirable things new*; *Num. 16. 30. Jer. 31, 32.* But was not their *Newness* one thing

which made them admirable? I hope both his instances were *new things* in the strictness of Sense, for when did the *Earth before open and swallow up men alive?* When was any before Christ so miraculously conceived? We do not much use to admire things we have seen a thousand times. 2. He asks, *If God never intends to stir up mens Affections by his Word, but when he tells them he will do a new thing.* What is that to the purpose? Is not therefore *newness* of a thing one means to stir up Attentions and a great one too, so far as it may be used without Sin? Then surely it may be used. He tells us, further that *True Religion and Devotion doth always incline to the same things.* Very true, as to the matter

matter and substance, but doth it so also as to Words and Syllables? Our Answerer hath heard of *ἡμῶν ἡμῶν* speaking the same things in a new manner; and certainly Experience will tell us that the doing this in Divinity, as well as in History, contributes to the generality of Peoples Attention.

7. He comes p. 82. to consider what I said to prove that *Forms in Prayer* hindred Fervency. This I proved, 1. *On the Ministers part*, from the vast difference betwixt words following the Affections; and Affections following of Words; urged both by Dr. Ames and Mr. Calderwood, in his *Altare Damasceum*. This our Answerer grants as to the first use of any Form (but if it cannot be once lawfully used, how shall it be lawfully used a second, third, fourth time?) But it is not to be helped after once reading without Previous Preparation, as our Answerer grants. So as the Question is, Whether it can be expected that ordinarily men should use such a Preparation, as should inflame their Affections to such a degree, as the heat should not abate before they come to their Work. For what he saith of the Peoples Fervency as it is not here spoken to, (for himself quoteth me saying no more then—As to him that ministrETH, there is a great deal of difference betwixt words following the Affections, and Affections following the words) so neither are the People to use any words at all, when they joyn with Ministers in Conceived Prayer; therefore their
their

their *Fervency* is not *hindred* by *Conceived Words*. It is a quite different *Species* of Prayer. The Minister Prayeth *Vocally*, the People onely in their Hearts; as to which the Ministers conceived *Words* and *Fervency* doth help, not hinder them, coming with prepared hearts; and this is a sufficient Answer to what he saith again p. 84. as if I had spoken very absurdly, in saying p. 28, 29. That I could not think it possible, *That the words of another should so well fit our hearts and be so expressive of raised Affections as our own*: He saith, I did not consider that what I thus spake tended to declare, that the People cannot with *Fervent Affection*, joyn with the Minister in any Prayer soever, because his words are not theirs, and then all Publick Prayer fitted to the People must be condemned and we must take up with Quakers or Papists? Still he seeks occasions against me, and exposeth me without Wit or Reason.

8. Now I would have him know that I did consider it. But I also considered that there is a *Vocal Prayer* and a *meerly Mental Prayer*, both of them our Duties at several times, the latter only the Peoples Duty in Publick Assemblies, where it is Gods Ordinance that one should minister to the rest. I do believe that no one of the People can be so *Fervent* when he joyneth with the Minister ministring words to him, as when in his Family or Closet, his Affections thrust them out of his own heart: But yet they may be so fervent as God requireth of them in such a service,

service, where he hath to avoid confusion, forbidden them the use of that *Mean* of *greater Fervency*. By which it appears our Answerer here triumphed before the Victory.

9. He cometh p. 85, 86. to speak to something which I had said p. 29. *That the Minister reading his Forms, there was a manifest impossibility of the like degree of Intention; for it is the Soul, which looking through the Eye, directeth it so as a Man readeth true, and so it is plainly diverted from its immediate Contemplation of and Fixation upon God.* I think it beneath me to speak any thing to what he afterward speaks, p. 96, 97. reflecting on me for saying in Prayer there is or should be a *Contemplation or Intuition of God*, as if none could say so, but those who had outdone St. Paul. The Answerer knew well enough, that St. Paul there speaketh of a seeing God in Glory: And that I was speaking, of *Beholding him in this life*. Where I hope tho none can see him *as he is*, nor *face to face*, yet they may immediately *contemplate God*. not with their *bodily eyes*, but the *Eyes of their mind*. In all *Meditation of God* in a mans closet there is such an *immediate Contemplation*. It is nothing but the Souls direct Motion to God. In all *Prayer* there is such a *contemplation*, or should be at least. This was therefore nothing but another attempt to expose me to such as know nothing of a Souls Communion with God in the Spirit. Let it pass, *Et valeat quantum valere potest.* Our Answerer

swerer (to return to his 85 p.) saith, *That this Argument doth not only recoil with equal violence upon my self (unhappy me to be Felode se so often) but it is against all Vocal Prayer (I should be sorry for that, but how doth that appear?)* For saith he, *The considering Words, Phrases, Method and Sense, is a different thing in Conceived Prayer, from the directing the Heart to God, and must take up more of his thoughts then the looking upon a Book doth.* But did I say then that in Prayer the Soul had nothing more to do, then to direct its Eye to God? I desire to know where; if I did not, this is nothing to the purpose. If he had but considered p. 30. of the Book, he would have found a great part of an Answer to this. The Soul in Prayer is to consider what it hath to say to God; which being considered or known, it is to direct it self unto God, with the greatest *Intention* and least *Diversion* that it can. Now this I say cannot be done so well by a Form, as in *Conceived Prayer*; for tho it is true, he who Prayeth *De pectore* from the Conceptions of his own Heart, must first consider his *Matter* and *Words*, yet. 1. *This is necessary*, so are not Forms. 2. *The Soul is all the while employed upon the work of Prayer, and its Acts are meerly Spiritual, and imminent Acts within its self.* But so are not its Acts in looking upon, and reading a Form, these are plain *Diversions* of the Soul to objects without it self, neither naturally necessary, nor from any Di-
vine

vine Precept necessary to the Action. So that he seeth I have not by my Argument destroyed all *Vocal Prayer*, but onely reformed and established it. And for what he saith of the Peoples hearing and observing the words spoken by the Minister, it is naturally necessary; for they cannot else say *Amen*. It is necessary by all those Divine Precepts which have established *Mental Prayer*, as the Peoples duty, in Communion with him that ministreth.

10. He comes in the next place p. 87. to prove, That *Conceived Prayers*, as the publick Service of the Church, may be an Impediment of Devotion. I have proved that *Forms must be from a necessity of Nature* (as to the Ministers Devotion at least) He only undertakes to prove, That *Conceived Prayers* may be concerning the Devotions of the people; and of this he giveth us a five-fold Account;

“ 1. They are not certain that they can
 “ joyn in the matter of a new *Conceived*
 “ Prayer, till they have considered it. 2.
 “ They may be too apt to give their minds
 “ too much liberty, to observe the man-
 “ ner or composure; to judge of it or imi-
 “ tate it. 3. They hinder Peoples Praying
 “ wirth one Accord. 4. Some want quick-
 “ ness of Capacity to go along with New
 “ Prayers, who can Devoutly and Piously
 “ joyn with those they have been acquaint-
 “ ed with. 5. All Impertinencies, unbe-
 “ coming Expressions, results of Passions,
 “ Imprudencies, &c. which may be in-
 con-

"in conceived Prayers ; hinder Devoti-
"on.

For the first of these, *There is no need of any such thing, that People should afore-hand be certain what Petitions their Ministers will put up in Prayer, nor doth God any where require it, nor any right reason enforce it.* How doth it appear that all the Congregation of Israel were certain before-hand what Solomon would, and did pray for, 1 Kings 8. 22? Or what Hezekiah would, and did pray for, 2 Chron. 30. 18. or Josaphat 2 Chron. 20. 5. or Ezra, Ezra 9. 5. It is wonderful these great Men could not see the necessity of this Device, for promoting Peoples Devotion. Nor doth any Reason shew it. I know nothing any Man or Woman hath to do, who is to joyn with another in Prayer, (but keeping his heart in Heaven as much as he can, to attend to the words said, or read by the Minister, and making up a judgment on each Petition, if he or she apprehendeth it to be according to the Will of God, earnestly and believingly to desire it: this they may as well do upon hearing a Conceived as a Read Prayer.

For his Second Particular, it is a *May Be*, rising from Mens Lusts, easy to be avoided without providing Forms, which will as little secure the Devotion against other Lusts of a far more hainous Nature.

3. The Third is non intelligible, why People may not pray with one Accord,

G.

whilst

whilst the Minister without a Form ministrereth words to them ; especially, if as our Answerer told us , in the last Chap. *Prayer be not so much a Verbal thing.* I am sure *Prayer* in the Congregation by the People is not a *Verbal thing*, but meerly *Mental*. For what he saith *Fourthly* it may be true, where People study *Searcht Prayers*, such as *Dr. Feastly* reflects on in his *Ancilla Pietatis*, but in no case else. 5. For *Impertinencies*, *Inconvenient Expressions*, &c. which we are so often told of. I have heard more (some within these 28 days) from Ministers false reading the *Forms*, then ever I heard from *Conceiv'd Prayers*; both proceed from a non attentive mind, which I am sure *Forms* will not prevent, but rather give *Temptations* to (by allowing the thoughts more liberty to the contrary.)

III. I have nothing to do with what our Answerer saith, p. 89, 90, 91, and 92, being not concerned to oppose his *Vindication* of himself, from what I never charged him with: But he hath three *Observations*, which begin p. 91, which I must concern myself with. The First is :

That Attention, Intention, and P. 91, 92. Fervency, & not the whole business needful to be minded, and taken care of in the Publick Service of the Church, but rightly ordered Matter, due Expressions, and Behaviour; and where Forms have the advantage.

I answer, not at all. As to Behaviour, a law may

may help that, but sure a Form of Prayer cannot. For the other Two things, they are no more necessary to be taken care for, as to Prayer, then as to Preaching. Then it seems all Ministers must Preach by Forms too, or else the Church ought to take care, that Ministers for Matter and Phrase speak fitly in the Peoples name to God; but need take no care that Ministers speak fitly in Gods Name to the People. 3. The care the Church ought to take, should be, That none be admitted as Ministers in it, who are not able to do both; and when all is done, some Errors will be. Another thing he saith that must be cared for, is, *That Mens Devotion may be so, as not to cross other Duties.* It is impossible it should, for it would no longer be Devotion. But what other duty will be hindered by *Conceiv'd Prayer*? That which he instanceth in is *Preservation of Unity and Obedience to Superiours.* But are these Duties, when the business contended for, is that this thing (so far as the Persons concerned can judge) and as they are ready to argue) is not lawful? And when they oppose the first and great Commandment. To which the Second (tho like to it, I and to which both these relate) is and ought to be subordinate.

12. His Second Observation is, *That there may be a want of due Devotion, Attention, and Fervency, in those that use Forms, and yet this not proceed from the Form.* This is doubtless true, if he meaneth solely, and

chiefly ; but what is this to the purpose, when the business of the Argument is, to prove that in him that *ministreth*, a Form must necessarily hinder degrees of *Attention* and *Fervency*? This observation is true, or false, as his answer to the Argument is good or bad ; which I leave to the Reader to judge from my reply to it.

13 His Third observation. p. 95. is:

That Publick Service ought to be so ordered, as may fit the General Temper of the true Christian Spirit, but must not be censured if it fit not with the Inclinations of all particular Persons.

Agreed, therefore said the Author, let it be so ordered, that those who desire it, may have a Minister to pray with and for them, by a Form, and others may have one that may pray *with* and *for* them, from the Conceptions of his own Heart. It is very like the *True Christian Spirit* may be found in the latter, as much as in the former, if that Spirit be a Spirit of Holiness, and of the Fear of the Lord, of Love to God, and Communion with God, as I think it is, and believe most Christians are of my mind.

C H A P.

C H A P. IV.

A Reply to the Vindicators Second Section of his Second Chapter ; concerning the judgment of other Divines. What is in the Reasonable Account concerning the judgment of the Leiden Professors, Dr. Ames, the Divines of the Walachrian Classis further considered, and vindicated. Whether in Acts of External Worship, there be any thing which hath in it, an Intrinsical Piety, Religion, or Devotion, Antecedaneous to the Revealed Will of God? Whether God requireth the same degree of Attention and Fervour in all Duties?

1. **T**HE Answerer begins his Second Section, p. 98. with telling us, That he proposed it as useful, to try the Issue of the thing in question, *viz. Whether Forms of Prayer were any prejudice to Piety or Religion.*

“To consult the judgment of them who
 “are least partial, and yet able to make
 “a true estimate, and especially to con-
 “sider the Evidences of Reason, which
 “may be produced. He saith, I agreed

it. But how? take my words, p. 44.

Indeed it is very reasonable in this case, That if the Proposition be not of that Nature, with reference to several Persons, that the experience of Christians be variable in the case, it is reasonable that the Major part of pious and able should be taken into Judgment, or rather Counsel. — But I further told him, That we believe the Experience of Christians may be really different in this case: some may find the use of their own Gifts more advantageous, others may possibly find Forms more advantageous; it depends much on the degree of the Gift each one hath received. But every one is bound to use that lawful means which he by experience findeth most conducive to himself, to keep his thoughts attentive, and his affections fervent; so as one may be under an obligation a divine obligation not to use Forms, another for the present to use them. So as I did not think this matter of a Superiours command, because an Universal command here, must necessarily trespass (as to some) upon a Divine Obligation, which hath pre-obliged them to the contrary; the command of Attention and Fervency in Prayer; which they must not violate, in obedience to any man, as all Divines agree. I think this is Sense and Divinity.

Now good Reader observe what our Answerer (who hath so often told the World, there is no weight, no strength, no truth in what I say) replyeth to this.

2. He

2. He tells us, That He who seriously minds
 " his duty, must also have a conscientious re-
 " gard to *Unity, Order, and the Duty of due sub-*
 " *mission: and the observing them, are not the*
 " *way to make him less devout, and fervent—That*
 " *the Exercise of one duty will not hinder us in*
 " *another—That the Promises of Gods Grace and*
 " *Presence, are chiefly made to them who em-*
 " *brace Peace and Unity.* I do very well know
 that there are *Precepts* for, and *Promises*,
 to *Peace and Unity*, and those that follow
 it, and some of those *Precepts*, which al-
 so direct us how to follow it; as *Heb. 12.*
14. Follow Peace with all Men and Holiness,
Rom. 12. 18. If it be possible, as much as
lyeth in you, live peaceably with all Men: So
 that *Unity and Peace* is no further our duty,
 then it is consistent with *Holiness*, which
 surely lyeth in the discharge of our *Obliga-*
tions to God: No further then it is *possible*
for us, and as in us lyeth. Now it is not
Morally possible for us, it *lyeth not in us*, to
 be at *Peace* and in *Unity* with them, who
 will be in no *Peace and Unity* with us, un-
 less we will consent to please them, to
 quit what we verily believe is our *Obliga-*
tion to God, viz. To Pray with the great-
est attention of our thoughts, and fervency of
our Spirits. *Fathers, and Authority of*
Men enough, might be quoted in this case,
 but that I fancy no such *Ostentation.* There
 are *Precepts* also requiring *order and due*
submission to Governours, but they must both
 be expounded as the other. Will any one

then in his right reason urge us with *Precepts to Unity, Order and Submission*, in a case where the question is, Whether we can follow these *Precepts with Holiness*, yea or no? Whether they be morally possible, or lie in us yea or no? Or, Whether before ever any such precepts of Men were, we were not pre-obliged to the contrary by God?

3. To as little purpose is his Text, *Matth. 5. 23, 24.* brought; for our Brother neither *bath nor can have any thing against us*, (tho he be offended at us) if he be offended at us meerly, because to be at *Unity* with him, or to please him, we will not violate an *Obligation* which we believe was ever upon us from God. Now that we have such an *Obligation* upon us, this Argument was brought to prove, *Because we have an Obligation upon us, to the greatest attention of thoughts and fervency of Spirit in Prayer*, and this we cannot discharge (as we upon experience find) by *Praying by Forms*. But he promiseth us a discourse hereafter, about *Superiors power in this case*: To which time we shall adjourn this discourse, only minding him, that my instance of a command to Pray with our Eyes *shut or open*, was not brought as a *Comparison*, but as an *Instance*. That there are some things indifferent, that are not the object of *Superiors commands*. Yet we cannot but judge such a command as momentous, as a command one while to pray *standing up*, another while *kneeling down*, what speaking evil

evil of Dignities, this is, I cannot understand; but I am sure in this and many other things as causelessly, he pleaseth himself to speak *evil of me*; which speaks him not very consistent of the Validity of his own Answers. It useth to be the policy of Commanders in an Army, when they know they have beaten their Enemy, to multiply their Adversaries Numbers, and magnifie their Courageous Fighting: but I see my Adversary is ruled by other Politicks.

4. He comes in the next place, p. 10. to tell us, *There can be no Publick Worship in any Church, unless it be first determined to be either with, or without a Form*, we desire no other determination then, *That it may be determined lawful for Ministers to Pray with, or without a Form*; and thus this point is determined by the Churches of God in France, and Holland. It is determined in New England, and Scotland, *that it shall be without a Form*. I ask not so much, yet surely there is with this Doctors leave *Publick Worship* in all these places and therefore if his meaning be, that there can be no *Publick Worship*, unless *one way be fixed of them two*, and the other destroyed, he condemns all the *Publick Worship* of France, and Holland, where either of them is at liberty. There is therefore no necessity for the determination of all Men in this case, before there can be any *Publick Worship* of God, no not by him that officiateth; unless he means as to a *Particular Act*; and therein

therein he saith true ; but in the same Congregation Publick Worship may for ought I know be this day performed, by one that useth no *Form*, and to morrow by another who useth a *Form* (not having Gifts , or being not confident he hath , or being hindered by God at this or that time, as to the use of them.)

5. At length he comes to the two Testimonies, that of the *Divines of Leiden* and that of the *Walachrian Classis*, which he had brought to prove, that they judged it lawful for all Ministers in their Ministerial Acts of Prayer, to use *Forms of Prayer* composed, tho by Men not Divinely inspired; tho he tells us p. 3. he laid no great stress on them, yet because he chargeth me with not giving a true account of them, and calls it, an high degree of *Carelessness* and not *Faithful dealing*; I must examine the matter again.

1. He agrees (as I said) p. 46. of the *Reasonable Account*, that the *Walachrians* professed to agree with *Amesius*, and he agrees that *Amesius* was not for preferring *Forms* before conceived Prayer. Well then, where was the Error I committed, shewing myself careless and unfaithful? He tells us that the *Walachrians* only declared their Agreement with Dr. *Ames* in that Question, *Whether Forms were lawful for Prayer and administering the Sacraments, in whose Churches that used them were guilty of Superstition and Will Worship*; and whether men might

might retain Communion with those Churches that used them? In these words the *Walachrians* state the Question, and that in the very place quoted in *Dr. Faulconers Libertas Eccles. p. 121. Considerat. Cap. 7. qu. 2.* The very first words in Answer to this Question are, *Nos in hac controversia faciles accedimus iis, quæ ab Amesiis super hac Quæst. scribuntur.* What faithful Answerer? I acknowledge this to be the sense of *Amesius*. But it should have been observed by our Author, "That the *Walachrians* only declared their Agreement with them in that Question, which was by them propounded; then he repeateth the Question which I have translated *Verbarim*. Doth our *Vindicator* call this an Answer, or a Vindication? "He told us the *Walachrian* *Classis* in Zealand, do in like manner declare publick Forms to be lawful, and profitable for the direction of the attention of the Auditors, and preserving Uniformity; *Libertas Eccles. p. 121.* to prove this he quotes *Consid. Cap. 7. Qu. 2.* I look that *Chap.* that *Q.* I tell him, That the *Walachrian* begin their Answer to that *Q.* with saying:

"They easily agreed to what *Dr. Amesius* had said upon this Question (which is the Question before stated) the Question quoted in *Libertas Ecclesiastica*.

Now saith he, I should have considered that they declared their Agreement with
Dr. Ames

D. Ames in that Question by them proposed. Very good, and that Question proposed is the very Question *Libertas Ecclesiastica* referred me to. Is not this enough? But he tells us it is another Question, "*Whether Praying by Publick Forms be the most useful way of performing that Service?*" What have I to do with another Question? I was only to speak to the Question quoted, and this is that Question I am sure. Neither is there any other Question in all those *Considerations* stated about *Forms of Prayer*: Besides our Question is about *Lawfulness*, for all *Ministers* to use them, Dr. Ames with whom the *Walachrians* profess to agree in this Question, saith expressly, *Cas. Consc. 14. c. 17. qu. 4.*

None ought to acquiesce in
Liber as Ec- Praying by Forms, but to la-
clef. p. 121. bour for an ability that he may
Pray without this help. And
gives four reasons for it. The first is:

"That while a prescrib-
Reasonable Ac- "ed form doth not follow
count p. 46, 47. "our affections, but plainly
"lead them; he who so
"prayeth, doth that which is of the Nature
"of Prayer less perfectly. Now with this
man (as to the Question be-
Vindication fore translated) the *Walachri-*
p. 106. "ans who spoke to no other
Question about Prayer in all
their Books, profess they readily agree. Judge
good Reader who hath dealt less faithfully
with

with thee , I, or the *Vindicator* , look but the Books set in the Margent.

6. But he tells us , *They could not agree with those of Synopsis pur. Leyden and Dr. Ames too. Theol. Disput.* They plainly say they do a- 36. Sect. 33. gree with them both. Let us see that. The words of the *Leyden Professors* in the place cited, are these :

“ There is a Question usually made (*so it is no novel Question*) whether it be lawful to use Forms of Prayer , publicly or privately ? We say , If they be pronounced *with due attention of Mind* [mark pronounced] and with due attention , they are not only lawful , but very profitable.

1. Because every Christian hath not an Ability , and the attention of the People in great Meetings is not a little helped by usual Forms. Upon which account God himself directed the Priests a Form of Blessing under the Old Testament, *Nam.* 6. 24. &c. And Christ upon the Cross is observed to use that Form of Deprecation , which *David* (who was a type of him) used, *Matth.* 27. 46. and the Disciples of Christ, *Luk.* 11. 2. asked Christ to teach them to Pray , as *John* taught his Disciples. To whom Christ answered, “ When you Pray , say *Our Father* , &c. “ from which Circumstances of the Words , “ it is manifest , that this Prayer of Christ “ was not only a Rule to Pray by , but also a Form of Prayer , as all the
Ancient

" *Ancient Church* thought unquestionable.

Sect. 34. " But in the mean time we do
" confess, That it is profitable, yea almost
" necessary, that all grown Believers, and
" especially the Pastors of Churches,
" should stir up in themselves, the *Gift of*
" *Praying*, publicly without previous
" Forms; that as occasion serveth, and ne-
" cessities renew, they may pray and give
" thanks; as we read, that Holy Men,
" Prophets, and Apostles did often do,
" both in the Old and New Testament;
" which will not be difficult for them, if
" they observe the Method of Prayer, and
" be frequently exercised in it.

7. This is all which those learned Pro-
fessors say. Now I must profess I see no
reason for what our *Vindicator* saith, That
the *Walachrians* could not agree with Dr.
Ames, and the *Leyden Professors* too; one
thing is, Dr. *Ames* is put first: Whether
they also agreed with the *Leyden Professors*,
is not much material, let those words be
blotted out. I have enough to make me
understand their Sense upon the Question,
in their telling me. They readily agree
with Dr. *Ames* in this Controversie. If it be
not possible they should agree with the
Leyden Professors too, then their Testimony
against us signifies nothing, for they con-
tradicted themselves, and Dr. *Ames* did
not agree with those of *Leyden*; but I do
not think so. It may be our Answerers
mistake only.

8. Nothing

8. Nothing can be certainly concluded in the cause, but I think I shall offer what any unbiaſt Reader ſhall judge very probable in the Cause. All Divines that will ſpeak clearly and diſtinctly in this Cause, muſt diſtinguiſh betwixt ſuch as are more imperfect and low in Knowledge and Gifts, and ſuch as are more grown and perfect. So that Acute Caſuiſt Dr. Ames diſtinguiſheth; and certainly ſo do the Leyden Profeſſors, and it is apparent from their words: 2. They (like Divines) accordingly deliver their minds in two Theſes. The one (which is the 33) relating only to *Chriſtians* and Miniſters, in a more Imperfect State, while they have not the Gift of Prayer: As to theſe, they determine Forms of Prayer both lawful and neceſſary, eſpecially where ſuch Miniſters in a low ſtate of the Church, have great Congregations, for there their hearers are more advantaged doubtleſs by a Form, then they would be by the uſe of ſuch Perſons own Abilities (for they are not two Sentences, but one; *because every Chriſtian that is a Miniſter, hath not an Ability, and [in ſuch caſes] the hearers are more advantaged by Forms, and the Perſon miniſtring doth well, for tho he offereth a Female, he hath no Male in his flock; for of all the inſtances they give, there is not one other. Such was the ſtate of all the Miniſters of the Jews, of all the Diſciples of John, and of Chriſt his own Diſciples, before the days of Pentecoſt; prophecied of*
under

under the Old Testament, by the Prophet Joel, *when God would pour out his Spirit on all Flesh*, Acts 2. 17. Joel 2. 28. that is, imperfect comparatively, with what it was after the Effusion of the Spirit. Upon this Account Christ saith, *Tho to that day there had not appeared Birth of Women, one greater then John Baptist, yet the least in the Kingdom of God, should be greater then he*; greater as to Spiritual Gifts, Knowledge, Utterance, able to speak greater things then he could. And the Promises are to Christs Disciples for *doing greater things* (not then Christ could do, but) *then he did do*, because he was ascending to his Father, John 14. 18. with many others of like import, proverth this. And it is certain that till that time, the Apostles had very imperfect Knowledge of the great Mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven, the Union of Christ and his Father, John 14. 8, 9. The Sitting at Christs right hand in his Kingdom, &c. And in this state, and during this state, it is not unreasonable to think Christ should give his Disciples a *Form of Prayer* at their request, yea of *words* to be used in Prayer.

9. In the 34 *Theses* these Learned Professors determine in the case, *as to such as are Profectiones*, better grown, for these they judiciously determine (and especially for those amongst them, that are Pastors of Churches) *that it was advantageous, yea upon the point necessary for them, To stir up*
an

in themselves the Gift of Praying Publickly, without Forms. 1. That they might be able to Pray upon all occasions and emergencies. 2. That they might be like the Holy Men, Prophets, and Apostles, who so Prayed, and tells them this was no hard thing to attain, if they observed the due Method of Prayer, and frequently exercised themselves in it.

10. So that I see no difference betwixt the judgments of Dr. Ames and the Professors of Leyden in the case. Those of the Province of the Walachrians tell us, They as to this Question agree with these. If they afterward say any thing which doth not agree with them, we are not concerned to justify or to follow them. For Mr. Calvins opinion in *Epist. ad Protectorem*. 87, If our Reader will but consider that it was wrote at a time, when Popery was but turning out of England, when the Nation had but very few Bibles in our own Languages, and very few Protestants that could read them, he will not wonder at Mr. Calvins judgment. Those who are most against imposing Forms Universally, now, would have been as much for an Universal imposing of them then, during such a state; and do think it necessary now, if Spain or Portugal, were Reformed: The Priests in corrupt Churches (I mean the generality of them) seldom complying with a Reformation, and the number of others who will humble themselves (as they think) to the work of

the Ministry, and have any abilities for it, being every where very small. Our *Vindicator* laying no great stress upon this Testimony (as he tells, p. 111.) we see no great reason to contend for the Sense, it being but the Sense of a *particular Class*, and we being tully of the mind of these great persons with whom they profess to agree, it is no great matter whether we agree with them or no, because they cannot agree with themselves as our Answerer noteth.

11. Our *Vindicator* goeth on and telleth us, he had in his *Libertas Ecclesiastica* brought three *Arguments*, to prove, *That forms of Prayer* were of no disadvantage to *Piety*. The first was *From Gods prescribing a constant form of Prayer for the Jewish offerings, and for the Priests blessing, our Saviours directing the Lords Prayer, but the Holy God, our Blessed Saviour, would not impose what is of its own nature an hindrance to Godliness, Piety, and Religion*. My Answer was to this Sense. That it was wild (in a matter of Worship especially) to conclude, mans power from Gods fact. That because God might prescribe, therefore man might prescribe. Our *Vindicator* here now tells us, *He is not so void of all Reverence to God, as so much as to think so*. I truly hope so, much less so void of all sense and Reason, but what then is that which our Answerer would conclude from thence? *That these things cannot prejudice Religion, he saith*.

12. If we could once agree upon terms, I would hope all sober and good men would agree.

agree. That which makes us differ, is we use General terms of *Religion, Piety, The Church, Schisme, Seperation, &c.* and will never let one another understand what we mean by them. *Piety* and *Religion* here are these æquivocal Terms that deceive one party. We are here arguing about *Prayer*, as it is a part of the *Instituted Worship of God*, and in no other sense. *Instituted Worship*, is not what is commanded by the *Law of Nature*, but by the *Will of God revealed in his Word*. We say that it is thus commanded by God, not onely that we should pray, but that we should pray with the utmost *Attention of our thoughts, to our work, and with the utmost intention of our mind, and pious fervour*. This (say we) we profess we cannot do by forms. Yes (saith our *Vindicator* you may, or else God would never have prescribed forms of *Prayer* and *Blessing* to the *Jewish Priests*, nor *Christ* to his *Disciples*. How doth this follow? Is God then obliged, in a piece of Service, (which is no service to him, but only because he so willed it) to will it to all Persons and at all times, under the same Circumstances? Who will deny a Prince the liberty to direct one Subject to perform his Homage to him one way, and another to pay it another way; yea though the Act of Homage be specifically the same? And shall we deny God that liberty, who is the most free of all Agents, and the King of Kings?

14. So that the *Answerer* either very

H 2

weakly,

weakly, or very invidiously saith, That the sense of my Answer is, "That the God of infinite Goodness, and Purity, may appoint, and enjoin, and consequently may be pleased with such things as in their own Nature are hurtful to Piety, and oppose Piety and Goodness in the World: when as the sense of my Answer (as is obvious to every understanding Reader) is no more then this, That the God of infinite liberty to direct his Homage in what manner he pleaseth, may appoint several persons in several ages, and under several dispensations, yea, and several persons in the same age, to Worship him in the same *specificall Acts of Worship*, sever al ways as he pleaseth, and each of them because he so appoints them, shall be *Pious, Religious, Good, and Pure*, and that as to those Persons whom he so commands, most Good, Pious and Religious.

14. And upon this foundation it was, That it was Pious to the Jews to Worship God by the *Levitical Offerings*, &c. which to us would be impious, not only because he hath expressly forbidden them, but because he hath not commanded us any such thing: And if God or Christ did prescribe *Forms of Prayer or Praise* to the *Jews*, or to some particular *Christians*, under some particular *Circumstances*, the use of them as to them, or any under the same Circumstances, may be *Pious, and Religious*, and doubtless is so, and yet not so to others,

thers, who are or may be under other *Circumstances*, and other *Precepts*, relating to them as under such *Circumstances*; and this is our very Case. *Persons that have not Abilities fitly to express their Minds to God in Prayer*, are under different *Circumstances*, from those who have such *Abilities*, and so may be under different *Obligations of Divine Precepts* in the case. God not commanding those to whom he hath not given the best means, to pray with the greatest *Attention of thoughts*, and *Intention of Mind* and *Fervor*, who are not able to do it, but only to do it so far as they are able. But in the mean time, these precepts oblige all to their utmost Ability to do it. And this is a full, or at least a sufficient Answer to what our *Vindicator* saith in his long *Vindication* of his Argument from his 113 to his 129 page. For, not to multiply words to no purpose, let men believe what they will, whether the *Form of Blessing* was to be used as a *Form*, and the *Lords Prayer to be used as a Form*, yea or no. (Great Authors are in both sides in the case) It proveth no more, then that *Forms of Prayer are not in themselves so evil, that God himself cannot prescribe and legitimate them*; which none but mad men will say they are, or (as this Author phraseth it) that they are not *in their own Nature hurtful*, and so hurtful, as God cannot command the use of them, which is a degree of badness, which very few things have. In

the mean time they may be *sinful enough*, as contrary to the *Divine Will*, and that tho not to all Persons, yet to some Persons; which is all I contend for.

15. And here I must crave pardon of my *Reader* for giving some instances of things which God by his command could not legitimate, as to those persons to whom he gave the command. *Murder* and *Incest*, I admire how they slip my pen (tho our *Vindicator* who lasheth me sufficiently for much lesser Errors than this, taketh no notice of it) for tho it be true, God cannot make *Murder* and *Incest* lawful, yet that is but trifling, because they will not be *Murder* or *Incest* when he hath commanded them. But God by a *Special command* to particular persons, may make those actions lawful, which if any others did without such a *special command*, they would be *Murder* and *Incest*, and unlawful: So it was lawful by vertue of Gods command to *Abraham* for him to *think upon*, and *design the killing of his Son*, to *prepare means for it* and *go about it*, and also to have done it. But I hope our *Vindicator* doth not think this would have been, or is lawful for any other persons, under the circumstance of *no such special command*; and this will let the *Reader* see how little to the purpose the *Vindicator* speaks of this p. 116. I appeal to every man of Sense, whether that instance was not good enough to prove, That God by his command may make some things lawful, which without such command to those particular

particular persons, had been unlawful, and are unlawful, as contrary to his Revealed Will, as to any others who have no *such command*, but his *General Rule* to the contrary. What but the special Command of God to Magistrates, makes it lawful for them to execute malefactors, or by their Souldiers to kill men in just wars? What but the *special permission* or *license* of God, makes it lawful to *kill men* breaking open their houses, or in their *own defence*. The General Precept is, *Thou shalt not kill*. But this is abundantly enough to shew his poor *Vindication* of his first Argument founded on this *Mistake*, That we say, *Forms of Prayer do in their own Nature hinder Piety*.

16. The truth is, there are some things so intrinsically evil that *God cannot make them lawful*; but these are very few (nor are all men agreed in this) for my own part I do agree with those who think, there are *Eternal Ideas* both of *Good* and *Evil* (I know it is a *Subtil Question*) but I cannot think that God can authorize a person, to *deny his Being*, or to *Blaspheme himself*: God cannot deny himself, nor expose his own *Essential Glory*. But that God cannot make the same thing both *lawful* and *unlawful*, the doing of which at all, or in such or such a manner, does meerly *depend upon his Will*, is to me little better than *Nonsense*. Now whether God would be worshipped, or should be worshipped by *Vocal Prayer* or no? certainly depends upon his *Will*, and no-

thing but his Will; and if it be his will that all Persons should do it with the utmost attention of thoughts, and intention of mind, and fervor of spirit, they are able. And if one person be not able to do it, by forms prescribed by other men, and another be best able to do it so, it is plain that the Will of God in the case is different as to these two persons: and to tell us, that the first person may do it, without prejudice to his piety in the action, when all the piety of the action lyeth in *Obedience to the Will of God*, sounds in my Ears, very Atheologically, and awkly, to say no worse concerning it.

17. This miserable arguing makes me quite weary of replying (my hand is in, and I shall go through, but I think never to take up a pen again in this Case) p. 129. the *Vindicator* comes to Vindicate his Second Argument, which was from the lawfulness of *Singing Psalms in Meeter*, and *Reading the Scriptures*: We must put it into Form, or the Reader will never see the force or weakness of it. His Argument could be but this,

“If the Scriptures may be read with utmost
 “most attention of thoughts, and fervor of Spirit; and Psalms may be
 “sung (and that in Meeter) with the
 “utmost intention of Spirit, and attention of Thoughts, and they yet
 “be Forms, and not the the dictates
 “of our Hearts to our Lipps; Then
 “Prayers

“ Prayers may be put up to God by
 “ Forms composed by other Men, not
 “ divinely inspired, with the utmost
 “ attention of our thoughts, and in-
 “ tention, and fervor of our spirits. —

But. *Ergo,*—

The summ of my Answer was a denial of the consequence. My reasons were, and are: *Because these were Duties of different species, and the same Motions, Affections, and Degrees of Affection, are not by God required of us in all Duties.*

It is no Rule of *Logick*, or *Reason*, that *whatsoever may be affirmed or denied of one Species, may be affirmed of another*; for then we might conclude in *Animals*, that an Horse can discourse, because Man can. It is as true in *Actions*, in Religious Actions. *Worship* here is the *Genus*, *Reading the Scriptures, Singing Psalms, Praying, Preaching, &c.* are *Species* contained under *Worship*, as the *Genus*: We can neither affirm nor deny, all things concerning one of these *Species*, that we may affirm or deny of another. This is evident now to all, and might be justified in forty instances. The Question therefore is, *Whether God requireth the same affections, and the same degree of fervor of Spirit, in Reading the Scriptures, and Singing of Psalms, that he doth require of us in Prayer?* If he doth not, the Argument is *fallacious*, because of the manifest Transition *De Genere ad Genus*.

18. It is plain he doth not. Prayer (as
 I

I told him, p. 61.) is in Scripture called, a crying to God, a wrestling with him, a pouring out of our Souls, it must be with strong cries and groans. Is there any such thing said of *Reading the Scriptures*? Or of *Singing Psalms*? Attention of our thoughts indeed is required in all, so are such degrees of Fervor as are proper to those duties; but what if God will require some degrees of Homage to be performed to him one way, some another, some in a way not capable of the like degrees of *Attention* and *Fervour*, as others are (such I take *reading the Scriptures* to be) is it not enough for us to do that duty, with such degrees of *Attention* and *Fervour*, as he requires in that duty, tho we do not do it with such degrees of *Attention* and *Fervour*, as in that duty he hath not required? Or shall it be concluded by any man of reason, that the mean which God hath appointed by which we may serve him in one duty (as in *Reading the Scripture*, it is nothing but the use of our ability to read) which is not by reason of the infirmity of our nature capable of such an attention of our thoughts (which will wander if they have the least liberty) may be used in another duty of another *Species*, where God requires other *degrees of Attention and Fervour*: or that the mean which he hath given us for that duty is not necessary, but that duty also may lawfully be performed in the use of a mean, which

which doth hinder such degrees of Attention and Fervour?

19. This was the substance of one of my Answers (tho a little further opened.) now what saith our Vindicator to this? Truly little, what he saith is p. 135. in these words and no more. "But what he saith
 "That there are different workings of
 "the Soul towards God in Singing, and
 "in Prayer, I suppose he will upon further
 "consideration discern to be an oversight,
 "since the Application to God for the same
 "things, require the same Pious Exercises
 "of Mind, whether it be in Prose, or
 "Meeter; and it was another oversight,
 "that he declares me to know and confess
 "what he thus asserts, when I never de-
 "clared any such thing, but know the con-
 "trary. --- As to the last Clause Reader
 judge, see *Libertas Eccles.* p. 123. ---
 "Both in reading the Scriptures, and in
 "Prayer, our hearts ought to be religiously
 "moved towards God, tho in somewhat
 a different manner. Wherein have I wrong-
 ed him here? Neither see I reason to ac-
 knowledg the oversight: let him prove if
 he can, that we are obliged to *Sing Psalms*
 with an equal degree of *Fervor of Spirit* at
 all times, as we are to *Pray*. Though we may
 sing the *Words* of a *Prayer*, yet it is more
 then I know, that we are to make those
 words our *Petitions*, or to address our
 Souls unto God for the same things which
 are the matter of the *Psalms* we Sing. If I
 thought

thought so, I should hardly sing many of *Dauids Psalms*. having no occasion for the things he asked of God. Nor do I think Singing is *the Application of our Souls to God for obtaining Mercies*, but the *Prædication of the Holy Name and Will of God*, and only to differ from *Reading the Scripture*, as the first is done with the *Modulation of the Voice*, the other not so; which *Modulation* is required, as having some force in it to excite several *Affections*, either of *Joy* or *Grief*, according to the matter sung. Further in the same page he saith:

“Tho there be different Acts of the
 “Mind exercised in these duties, yet that
 “Consideration, Reverence, Faith, Sub-
 “mission, and other Gracious Disposi-
 “tions, which suit the special parts of Di-
 “vine truth; doth require as much seri-
 “ousness, diligence and care in reading
 “the holy Scriptures.

But doth it require as much *Fervour of Spirit and Affections*? That is the Question; and the contrary was shewed by the Phrases wherein *Prayer* is in Scripture expressed: but as to this not a word, onely he had shewed before, that a *Form of Words* in *Prayer* doth not hinder any *Exercises of Piety* therein. What he hath formerly said, I have formerly answered. I leave the Judgment to any Intelligent Reader.

20. I had further told him, That the *Scriptures* are *Divine Forms*, and reading them

them is a *Divine Precept*, and the *Forms we Sing, Divine Songs*, and the *Singing of a Congregation by a Form naturally necessary*, and the duty impossible to be performed, but by a *Form*. The Question was only stated about *Humane Forms*, and in a Case where no such thing is *necessary*; all the World will see the inconclusiveness of such Arguings. I shall not trouble my self to answer such things further, which nothing relate to the Question in issue, which himself owned to be *plainly and cleerly stated*. I wish I could say that on his side, it had been as *plainly and cleerly Argued* against.

CHAP. V.

An Answer to what the Vindicator hath said in his Third Section of Chap. 3. concerning the General use, or Impositions of Forms in the Primitive Church. Some further things noted of the Canons of the Provincial Councils of Laodicea, Carthage and Milevis. Farther Discourse upon the head of this Argument waved, because the Argument it self, if true, concludeth nothing, as to Lawfulness or Unlawfulness.

1. I am now come to the *Argumentum Palmarium* of our *Adversaries*; in this Question the *pretended Practice* of the Church for 1300 years. Indeed I always looked upon the Practice of Men a very poor Argument, where the Question was about the *Lawfulness* or *Unlawfulness* of an *Action*. And it is doubtless no Argument, tho *Ex Abundanti*. I did speak something as to that point, and since at the request of some Friends, have spoken much more in a *Supplement* to that Book. I shall now say little, but refer my *Reader* to my former *Book*, and the *Supplement* to it.

2. Our Author hath told us, "That it is not probable that such excellently Devout and Judicious Men as the 4th. and 5th. Century abounded with, should not discern helps and hindrances of Devotion. — I told him *it was possible*. Like one in *Cathedra*,-- he tells me, *This is a rash and contumelious Expression*. What is? That some particular Men, may be mistaken in a particular point: This is all can be made of my words, and such a point too, as is of a mutable Nature: for I have shewed before, *That that may be an hindrance to Devotion to one, which is not to another* (which is most certainly true.) Is this a contumely? when *David* saith, *All Men are Liars*, and tho he spake it in haste, yet it hath thus much truth in it, that there are in all Men grains of *Falshood* and *Error* and *Falsibility*.

Fability. Did ever any modest and judicious man, talk at this rate? When our *Articles* tell us, That the Churches of *Jerusalem*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, and all *Rome*, erred, both in matters of *Worship*, *Ceremonies*, and *Doctrine*. Artic. 1562. n. 19: may not we say it was possible that some Churches in the 4 and 5 *Centuries* might mistake?

3. I am not concerned to make good what *Smeftymnus* said, tho I knew the Men that made that Book, and know that none of them wanted learning: but for the Commissioners of the *Savoy*, their saying they could find no intire *Liturgies* within the first 300 years, doth not argue that they found any then; for I am sure they did not, but those being the times of the purer *Primitive Church*, they by their Commission were concerned to speak to no more. I do say it again that they might have said, *That they find no Record of any Liturgy universally used, or imposed, and commanded to be used by all for 600 years, till the time of Gregory the great; nor then by any imposed, but by Gregory the worst of all the Bishops of Rome before his time, whose Judgment and Practice in this case, signified little; but under the Protection of Charles the Great, 200 years after that.* I repeat not here an Answer to the Answers silly Reflection p. 138, I believe I knew what time *Gregory the Great* and *Charles the Great* lived, before our *Vindicator*

Vindicator could construe his *Cato*: and that his Book did not enlighten me with this glorious peice of Learning; the Supplement will inform him, and all those who have a mind to laugh at such lamentable Exceptions. We must attend hereafter to what our Author can say to prove *Liturgies* of Prayer, generally used or commanded to be used, before the time of *Gregory the great*.

4. In the mean time he takes notice, that I will not allow that the three *Canons* which he quoted, that of the Council of *Laodicea* cap. 18. of the third Council of *Carthage* can. 23. of *Milevis* can. 12. had any respect to *Liturgies* and their establishment. Where have I denied they had no respect to *Liturgies*? Or what doth he mean by *Establishment*? (For still it is not our Interest I perceive to speak plainly and distinctly) I have denied and do deny that those *Canons* have the least tittle of proof. That *Liturgies* in the time when those *Canons* were made; (and yet the last of these was more then 400 years after Christ) were generally used, or commanded to be generally used; one of which they must prove, before they have proved that my Opinion [That the Universal use of *Liturgies* is not lawful in all probability is false; because contrary to the judgment of the Church for 1300 years past.

5. I had reason to say so, when the last of these Councils was not till 402, and then made for a particular Church, and in a par-

particular case (which I have else where largely shewed and given a full account of it) and for the Two *Supplement p.*
 first, it is doubted whether e- 30, 31, 32,
 ver there were any such 33, 34, 35, 36.
 Councils; and tho this Au-
 thor produceth something out of *Justellus*
 to prove there was such a Council of *La-*
odicea yet there is no *Canon* of it, enjoyn-
 ing a *Form* of *Prayers* should be used morn-
 ing and evening. Other *Collectors* of
Councils, very ancient too, have no such
 Council; there was but 22 or 42 at it;
 and for the other 3, *Carthage*. *Justellus* tells
 our *Vindicator* the 23 *Cannon* could not be
 theirs, for that Council made but 21;
 nor is the 23th to be found in *Justellus* his
Code of the *African Church*, where it should
 have been if it had been of any authority:
 And our *Vindicator* tells us too, this *Code*
 was extant 451, so as at that time they
 knew of no such *Canon*. And though the
 first mentioned *Canon* of *Laodicea* was ta-
 ken into the *Code*, which *Code* was ap-
 proved by the Council of *Calcedon* Anno
 451. yet there is no proof that *Forms* of
Prayer were then generally used, or imposed.
 For the *Canon* it self mentions no more,
 then a publick *Ministry* of *Prayers* (as to
 which *Forms* are not necessary.) In the late
 times in *Colledge Chappels*, there was morn-
 ing and evening, αὐτὴ λειτουργία τῶν θυγῶν,
 where no *Forms* were used, but a cer-
 tain *Order* observed, all the *Week*, and
 I Year

Year long. And indeed this is an *usual Cheat* in these debates, when Men hear or read of a *Liturgy of Prayers*, they presently think there's a proof for *Forms of Prayer*, when it is but of late years, that the term *Liturgy* hath been appropriated to signify a *Common Prayer Book*. And admit there were such a Council of *Carthage*, and they made what is called the 23 *Canon*, which *Justellus* denieth, yet that (as I have shewed in my Supplement) determined no such thing; that of *Milev* or *Mela* indeed did, but in a very small Corner of the Church, and for a very particular reason, and the *Vindicator* cannot say these 2 *Canons* were ever brought into *Justellus* his Code, or confirmed by any general Council. But of this matter I have elsewhere said enough.

6. For what our Author objects p. 143. to prove the *Laodicean Canon* injoynd more then *the same Ministry or Order of Prayer*, even *Forms*. From the next *Canon*, it speaketh not a word of *Forms* more then the other, only three Prayers were made, *ἐκτελέσει, ψάλλει* are the words used, neither of them signifying the reading of a Prayer out of a Book by a Form. Whereas our Answerer p. 144. complains I have not read over or considered what he hath said, to prove that the *Canon of Carthage* (contrary to the plain

See at the end of the Book in the Review, a full Answer to all said by Dr. Faulkner on this head.

plain sense of the words) *commanded a Form*, he will find it taken notice of in my *Supplement*, largely enough, p. 28. For the *Council of Milevis*, it proves no universal use, nor any *Universal Imposition*. Now that *Forms* may be used by *some Ministers* and at *some times*, and that in *some particular Exigent* they may be *Universally Imposed for a time* (which was the cause then) I do not doubt: but enough is said of that Council, *Supplement* p. 30. 31, &c. I leave to any Reader to judge, whether it is not like a very great part of their Ministry were tainted with *Pelagianism*, whatever our *Vindicator* saith.

7. I shall not trouble my self further about this Section, the *Argument*, if it were good, concluding nothing as to the *Lawfulness* and *Unlawfulness*. I have said in my *Supplement* as much as I think can be said, at least as I can say; and so I think hath our *Answerer*: let the Reader judge who hath spoken with most probability, and from most *Credible Authority*. So far as we understand the truth of Church Affairs for the first 300 years (which we can have no great certainty of, for the generality of our *Editions* are from the *Papists*, who would let us know as litt'e of the truth as they could, where it was contrary to their Practice) what was held, practiced, and retained in the Church (not being matter of Faith) within two hundred years after Christ, is no great
 I 2 guide

guide to our Practice, tho I said and do believe, that *Forms of Prayer* were not generally used, nor by any Persons universally imposed on any considerable part of the Church, till Pope *Gregories* time Anno 600, nor then, more then *Canonically*, till 200 years after this, and am assured of this by *Durandus* a Papist, and my Lord of *Mirney* a learned Protestant; yet whether this be true or false, is not a farthing matter in the case; and I have something else to do then disputing *De lanâ caprinâ*, or whether it, or *that* be the truest *Orthography*. No understanding person that minds to keep the Protestant Religion, as to *Rites* and *Ceremonies*, will value any quotations at any rate, as to *Rituals*, which are out of Writers that lived at the distance of 300 years after Christ.

8. In his next Section, he doth not pretend to Answer any *Argument* of mine, but only to reflect upon some *passages* which (how justly let my Reader judge) he calls *Reviling*, and he hath (if it be so indeed) answered it, with *full measure pressed down*, and *running over*. I am not concerned to *Reply to him*, nor to the *Authorities* of *Capelus*, all whose words were no Oracles, as our Answerer himself also judgeth p. 180.

C H A P. VI.

A Reply to what the Vindicator saith in his 4 Chap. beginning p. 177. Whether in Vocal Prayer, words be not an Essential part of the Worship, which no Superiors can institute? Whether things in Acts of Worship, by Gods Institution, left to liberty of Ministers, or People, may be determined by any, but those to whom the liberty is left? About the Power of Superiors to command in Divine things, Whether he can command, what he judgeth to be indifferent, and the Inferiours judge Unlawful.

I. **O**UR Vindicator in his 4 Chap. which beginneth in his 177 p. pretendeth to Answer the Authors third Argument, which he had thus laid:

To use a Mean in an Act of Worship, which God hath neither directed by the light of Nature, nor by his Word prescribed; no natural necessity compelling us so to do, is sinful.

But for us or any of us, to whom God hath given the Gift of Prayer, ordinarily to
 I 3 *perform*

Reasonable
Account, p.
71.

perform our Ministerial
Acts in Prayer, by the
prescribed Forms of other
Men, read, or recited,
were for us (no natural
necessity compelling us so to do) in Acts
of Worship to use means, neither di-
rected of God by the light of Nature,
nor yet by him in his Word prescribed.
Ergo.

In proof of the Major I said, 1. That Di-
vine Worship, is nothing else but an Ho-
mage performed to God upon account of his
Excellency. 2. That it belongs to God to
appoint those Acts, and Means by whom
this Homage should be paid. 3. That God
hath determined (by the light of Nature,
and his Word given us) sufficiently both as
to Acts and Means, of this Homage. 4.
That he hath forbidden any other Means
in the Second Commandment, where un-
der the Notion of Graven Images, he for-
bids all Acts and Means of Publick Wor-
ship which himself hath not appointed; and
if this were not the sense of it, it were
impossible to reduce to that Commandment,
all the Precepts in Scripture as to Ex-
ternal Worship and Adoration. I also fur-
ther referred to what Mr. Cotton hath said
in this Case, in his Advertisements upon
a Discourse of Set Forms of Prayer p. 17.
18. &c. In my further Discourse upon
this Argument, I was led (in Answer to a-
nother) into a discourse about The power
of

of Superiors, in Gods Worship, to command, what they judged indifferent; but their Inferiours or Parties commanded judged sinful, and unlawful.

2. Possibly that discourse, contained two Questions in Divinity, upon which the main hinge of this Controversie lay; viz.

1. Whether man can lawfully institute at his pleasure Parts or Means of Divine Worship?

2. Whether Superiors can command Inferiours, in Divine Worship, to do any thing, which they the Superiors judge indifferent, (that is neither commanded, nor forbidden by God) but the Inferiours judge sinful, upon Arguments which to them appear highly probable.

Let us but be agreed in these two things, and we shall in this Controversie have little to contend about. Our Vindicator, who (in the Section immediately preceding, had spent 6 leaves in nothing but Reflections, spends but 8 leaves about this Chapter, which I doubt not but to shew him (except he had spoken closer to the thing in question) was much too little. But what doth he say?

3. He granteth p. 177. That all the parts of Divine Worship must be such as the light of Nature, or the Revealed Will of God directeth. Tho this be very true, yet what is it to the purpose? The Argument spake not of Parts, but of Means of Divine Worship, nor doth the second Commandment,

ſpeak only of *Parts* but of *Means*. Why doth he not either *affirm* or *deny*, that the *Means of External VVorſhip*, muſt be directed from God, either by the light of Nature or Scripture? But inſtead of this he runs to his uſual way of *Observations*.

4. He firſt obſerveth, That this contradicteth what I had before ſaid. That *Forms of Prayer may be lawfully uſed* [by ſome men, and at ſometimes] what if it did contradict what I ſaid before? The Argument may be good enough, notwithstanding *Nemo omnibus horis ſapit*. 2. But this is not ſo, for we are diſcourſing of what is lawful or unlawful, not as to what is meerly *Mental Prayer*, but as to *Minifterial Vocal Prayer*, which is the moſt perfect kind of Prayer: I have told him, that I believed, that he who prayed by the *Uſe of Forms*, only prayeth in *his Heart*. Now as to that *Act*, *Forms* may be *helps*, and ſo lawful to be uſed by thoſe to whom God hath not given *due means* for *Minifterial Prayer*, which muſt be *Vocal*, where the heart inditeth a good Matter, and the tongue (the proper Secretary to the heart) is as the Pen of a ready Writer. Now ſuppoſing (what our Answerer ſo zealouſly contends for) that God preſcribed Forms to the *Jewiſh Miniſters*, and that Chriſt Preſcribed *his Diſciples Forms* of Prayer to be ordinarily uſed. Means as to *Heart-Prayer*, are preſcribed by God in his Word, as to which kind of Prayer, words are
not

not necessary , for it may be performed without words, so as words are no *parts* of it.

5. *Forms* not directed by God or Christ , or any where in Holy Writ , cannot be an *External Homage to God*, or *part of External Worship* ; for our Author grants, that *Parts of Worship* must be directed by *Nature* or *Scripture* ; now such *Forms* are not directed by *Scripture* ; I am sure they are not directed by *Nature*. Besides, if they were an *External Worship*, or *part of it*, they must be never omitted. Now that *Vocal Prayer* is a *part of External Worship*, distinct from what is meerly *Mental*, cannot be denied ; for that *Prayer* which is meerly in the heart, I am sure is not the *Publik Worship* of a *Minister in the Congregation*.

6. Hence it followeth , That he who prayeth by *Forms* only, prayeth *Mentally*, as all the *People* do, who joyneth with him who *Ministreth* in *Prayer* : For the *Ministers* reading a *Form*, can be no *part of External Worship*, because in it, he is neither directed by the *Light of Nature*, nor by the *Will of God in Scripture*. It is only an *help* to himself or others, or both, to order himself, and people by, in their *Mentall Prayers*.

7. Neither can I see how it can properly be called a *Mean* (unless the *Form* be particularly by God directed) of *Mental Prayer*. For in reason, the mean of meer internal

nal adorotian must be, *an Ability* so to adore which a man hath partly from *Nature*; (whence is his Ability to think and conceive) partly from the influence of the *Holy Spirit of Prayer and Supplication*.

8. His next *Observation* is as idle, as his *Reflection* in that Paragraph founded upon it is *impertinent*: it is this p. 179. "That according to this Argument, the conceptions and expressions of him who Prayeth without a Form, are as much forbidden as the use of Forms is pretended to be, because God hath not prescribed these Expressions. I had told him, that both the *Light of Nature*, and the *Will of God* declared in his Word, *I Tim. 4. 14. I Pet. 4. 10. Rom. 12.* have shewed us, That an ability fitly to express our minds that is our wants and desires, to God in Prayer, is the means which God hath prescribed for *Vocal Prayer*; how well he hath disproved what I said, let the Reader judge from my reply; so that in further answer to this his *Observation*, I shall but oppose another observation, and commend it to my Reader; viz. That he hath answered my Argument learnedly, by begging the Question, for this was the *Question* betwixt us.

9. But yet because our Author hath no mind to treat of *Means*, and to grant us that *Means* as well as *Acts* and *Parts* of *Divine Worship*, must have a *Divine Institution*; Let us take him at his own concession. That parts of *Worship* must have such an

an Institution; this he yieldeth *in terminis*, p. 177. I say that words in *Vocal Prayer*, are *parts of Worship*; his friend *Capellus* he owns hath affirmed it, *That by keeping to the constant use of a Form, men make it a proper part of Worship*. This he doth not like. But why then in the very same case about *Forms of Prayer*, doth

he choke us with what *Capellus* hath said. It is a just Rule in Law, *That he who hath produced a Witness in the same cause for himself, hath granted him a sufficient Witness, and shall never be allowed to except against him as not such*. I hope if *Capellus* his Authority be valuable against us, it is so for us.

Vindicat. p.
167, 173,
201.

10. But I have another Argument to prove, that *Forms of Prayer Universally imposed*, are *parts of Prayer*, proper parts of *Prayer*, that is *Vocal Prayer*; which alone is *Ministerial Prayer*: For the parts of that religious Action are *Two*; The one is *Internal*, which lyeth in the *Motions of the Heart and Affections*: The other is *External*, which are *Our words*. And these are the *two Essential parts of Worship* in that *Prayer*; take away either of them, and it is *no Prayer*, that is *no Ministerial Vocal Prayer*: And these or those words are essential parts of this or that *Ministerial Vocal Prayer*. Now if Men without express direction from God, may prescribe us *words*; they may prescribe an *Essential part of Worship*; which

which our *Vindicator* justly denieth they may.

11. His third Observation, p. 182. is, That in his *Libertas Ecclesiastica*. 2, Sect. Chap. 1. He hath largely proved, "That *it is a false and dangerous Position to say that* nothing may be used, or appointed in Gods Worship (besides necessary Circumstances of humane Actions) but what is appointed by God himself. — He addeth here, That it is destructive to *Publick Worship and Religion*. For since God hath commanded us to pray, but hath not in all Acts of Worship enjoined our words, or the performance of this duty with or without a Form, it must needs according to this Position, be done neither by a Form nor without, because both by consequence are forbidden being not prescribed. Then he telleth us, That God hath not prescribed what sort of bread, or wine, should be used in the Supper of the Lord, nor what Psalms should be sang. To which I reply,

12. I am not at leisure to reply to all he hath said in 72 pages of his *Libertas Ecclesiast.* but I do not remember that he hath there said, That Men may appoint *Essential*, or integral parts of *Worship*; if he hath, I am sure he hath denied it here, p. 177. Now I have both said, and proved, that words are an *Essential part of Ministerial, Vocal Prayer*. If there be no words used, there can be no such thing; therefore

b y

by our *Answerers* own *concession* words in this Prayer, must be directed by the *Light* of Nature, or by the *VWill* of God *VWritten* in his Word. I have shewed, that Gods *VWill*, is revealed in the cause, both in the *Light* of Nature, which directeth us to express our own thoughts in our own words, and by his *VWill* revealed, commanding us to *Minister* our Gifts, and according as we have received the Gift, or Grace. Neither do I remember that our *Vindicator* hath asserted, That Men *not* *divinely* authorized and inspired for that end, may appoint Means of *VWorship*. I am sure in this Book he is very shy of it, if he hath said any such thing elsewhere, it is false, and contrary to the Second Commandment. For any appointments of other things, in, about, or relating to the *Worship* of God, we are not here disputing, nor was the Question stated, with reference to them.

13. It is rashly (if no worse) said, That there can be no *Publick* *Worship* or *Religion* according to that Position. For it plainly inferreth, That in the Churches of God in Scotland, Holland, France, New England, &c. there is no *Publick* *Religion* or *VWorship*; for it is certain that in all, or most of them, there are no *Forms* of Prayer *Universally* used or imposed, tho there be in some of them, some made and left at liberty to be used or not used.

14. Whereas he saith, That according to
this

this Position, there can be no Administration of the Sacraments, because according to this Principle, all Bread, and Wine, is forbidden to be used in that Ordinance, because the particular kind of Bread and Wine is not prescribed: It proceedeth upon this Hypothesis, which is false; That we say, That nothing is left to our liberty, in, about, or relating to the Worship of God, because we say no Acts, Parts, or Means of Worship, are left to liberty. We say, that particular Phrases in Prayer and Preaching, so the particular kinds of Bread and Wine, to be used in the Lords Supper, are left to liberty but yet words are not left to liberty. Nor whether any Bread or Wine should be used, are not left to liberty; and where God hath left any thing to liberty, it ought not to be determined by Superiors; because it was the Will of God, that his People should have liberty in the case, and that liberty is a part of the Institution.

15. In the Old Law, where a strict Prescription of all Acts, Parts, and Means of Worship can be modestly denied by none, yet in the burnt offering of Fowls, Levit. 1. 14. the people were left to liberty, to bring either Turtle Doves, or any other Young Pidgeons, and in the Womans Purification, Lev. 12. 6. she had the like liberty. I would gladly know now if our Vindicator, or any sober man, thinks that the Superiors in the Church or State of the Jews, might have determined the Jews, and by
their

their commands enjoyned all the Jews to bring none but *Turtle Doves*? Or none but *Young Pigeons of another kind*? Or what president there is in Scripture of any *Ecclesiastical or Civil power*, that ever arrogated and assumed such a liberty, or declared that they judged such a thing lawful? This I think sufficient to have spoken to what our *Answerer* saith as to the first *Question*.

16. The Second *Question* was about the *Superiors power of commanding in Religious Acts*. A grave and weighty *Question*, an Agreement in which will bring us to a present issue as to all our Religious differences. Let us see what our *Vindicator* will grant in the case. He tells us p. 185.

"That if any Inferior, or any person
 "whatsoever, accounteth any thing to be
 "forbidden, *proceeding upon any good and*
 "*true grounds*, no such thing may be ap-
 "pointed, being in it self evil, whether the
 "Superior think it not necessary or by a
 "mistake thinks it necessary. We thank him
 for this, it is enough for us; nor shall we
 need repeat any thing more he hath in this
 Chapter said. I have onely this *Question*
 to ask, *Who, as to the Inferiors Practice, must*
judge, whether the Inferiors judgment proceedeth
upon just and true grounds. Let us but have
 this point freely and clearly spoken to. If
 he saith the Superior must judge, all this is
 just nothing, for those Superiors must be
 prodigiously wicked, that shall command
 their

their Inferiours to do that, which they judge the Inferiors upon good and true grounds judge unlawful. This were for him to command things, which he knew to be sinful.

17. If he saith (as he must do if he will maintain the Religion of Protestants) That tho the Superior be the judge of the lawfulness or unlawfulness of his commands, so far as concerneth his own Aēt in commanding; yet every Inferiour must judge of the lawfulness or unlawfulness of his Aēt, in obeying, and the truth and falsehood of the grounds upon which he proceeds. It is what we hold and agree in.

18. But still the true Question remains, upon supposition, That the Superior and Inferiour differ in their *Aprehensions* of a thing, the Superiour thinking upon such as he thinks good and true grounds, that the thing is lawful, The Inferior judging upon (what he thinks) true and good grounds, that it is unlawful.

Whether the Superior can command his Inferiors such things in the Worship of God, which he judgeth not necessary from the Light of Nature, or Revealed Will of God, and the Inferior judgeth sinful and what he may not do.
So then there are two things we yield in the case.

19. That as to things which are meerly Political and secular, the Magistrate may command what he judgeth necessary, or expedient.

expedient, for the *ends of his Government*; of which things, he hath no *Judge* (save God alone) *Superior* to him, and the *Inferiour* must obey him, where Gods *Will* doth not plainly controul; and if it doth controul him, he must patiently suffer the penalty for not doing them; for his *private Conscience* is no *Judge* of these things further then as to his own practice, whether they be contrary to the Rule of Gods Word or no.

20. That as to things of a more *Spiritual Nature*, which concern the *Worship of God*, the *Magistrate* is bound to command, what he, after diligeat inquiry into the law of God, judgeth *necessary*; that is commanded by God in his Word: and to forbid, what he judgeth there forbidden, and in these things the *Inferiour* is bound to obey. If in these things he judgeth diversly from his *Superiour*, he cannot do the things, but must patiently suffer. and the matter in difference must be by God determined at the last day, where the *Magistrate* (tho he then appears he was in a mistake) may hope for Mercy, because he did what he did, in the integrity of his heart. provided he neglected not due means for finding out of the Will of God, nor in his *Punishment for disobedience*, exceeded the Rules of Scripture, and right Reason, and Justice.

21. But we do not think, that in the *Worship of God*, especially as to the *Acts, Parts, or Means* of it (those being things,

of the truth or falshood of which the Will of God alone can determine, and which he hath sufficiently determined in his Word.) The Superior without sin, can command, what himself doth not from the will of God judge *necessary*, but he knoweth the *Inferiour* judgeth to be *sinful*.

1. Because he hath no power in commanding things of this nature, more then the Kings of *Israel* and *Judah* had, who had no power to bind up all the Israelites to bring Turtle Doves, when Gods prescription had left them at liberty, either to bring them, or young Pidgeons; nor was ever any such power assumed, by Magistrates under the ordinary Circumstances of Magistrates (that is being no Prophets, and divinely inspired, as were *David* and *Solomon*) who both were Pen-men of Scripture.

2. Because such commands must necessarily be for *Destruction*, not for *Ædification*, and the Apostle declared he had no such power, 2 *Cor.* 13. 10. such commands must necessarily be against *Charity*, tending to destroy Peoples Souls.

22. But as to this, our *Vindicator* tells us,
 “ That real Charity providing for the good
 “ and profit of the Souls of Men, is of far
 “ greater value, then that which I call Cha-
 “ rity gratifying and complying with men
 “ in their mistakes.

How properly this is spoken, and how prettily the Question here begged, let any

any ordinary Reader judge; was not I arguing for the good and profit of Peoples Souls and Bodies too? That which I call Charity is what the Apostle calls so, *Rom. 14. 15. If thy Brother be grieved with thy Meat (which thou mayest eat, or let alone) now walkest thou not charitably (that is in eating and so giving him occasion to sin) destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ dyed.* Can any Divine think that God in that Text hath not said to all Magistrates, in the matters relating to my Worship, make not him to sin by thy commands, which thou mayest or mayest not (as thou thinkest) at thy pleasure give out, for whom Christ dyed.

23. I appeal now to all rational and intelligent persons, whether the *Vindicator* or I, have spoken here most sense and pertinencies as to the matter in Question, *Whether Forms of Prayer in the publick Ministry, may be universally used or imposed.* This is all which I can find in this Chapter of our *Vindicator* worth any notice as to the Question in hand; for what is spoken, as to other *Rites, Ceremonies, and Gestures*, the lawfulness, or unlawfulness of them, it doth not concern our present purpose. Let us first have done with this *single Question*, and then we will if he pleaseth, discourse other things; in the mean time I intend not to swell a Book with Discourses *De Omni Ente.* Besides it may be, that by our close discourse upon this Question, we

shall be better prepared for others, which in my mind are much lighter, by understanding upon what principles we distinctly argue, and first exposing the truth or falshood of them to the judgment of the World. Our Vindicators Principles in this Chapter seem to be, 1. *That words in Vocal Ministerial Prayer, are neither parts nor means in that Worship.* 2. *That Superiors may determine whatever he judgeth God hath left at liberty in his Worship, though the Inferior thinks they are not there left at liberty.* I am not of his mind.

C H A P. VII.

Containing a Reply to what the Vindicator hath said Chap. 5. p. 193, &c. The Vindicator grants, the Superior may tie up Ministers and People to Forms in the publick Congregation, and in Families, but not in Closets. His reason, why not in Closets, holds, as to Congregations and Families. They have new Emergences daily. The Evil of tying up, all to Forms expressed, exemplified, in the neglect or omission of Prayers to God for deliverance from the late Hellish Popish Plot, and of Prayers for the perfecting of that

that Salvation: The Vindicator saith nothing cogent to prove that Forms of Sermons ought not to be as Universally imposed and used, as Forms of Prayer.

I. **T**HE Answerer p. 193, comes to my fourth Argument, which I laid thus:

To agree a Principle, which (being agreed) is of sufficient force to restrain the total exercise of the Gift of Prayer, is sinful. Reaso. Account p. 93. But to agree it lawful for Ministers ordinarily, in their Solemn Prayer, to perform their Acts of Prayer by the prescribed Forms of other Men, were to agree such a Principle. ——— Ergo.

I supposed, none would deny the first Proposition, because it could not be denied without allowing man, to suppress the total exercise of a most eminent Gift of the Holy Spirit of God. I proved the Second Proposition, by an induction of the several kinds of Prayer, and shewing, That the Superior had as much Authority to command the use of Forms in the Pulpit, as in the *Deske*, in our Families as in either, yea and in our Closets too, and the Inferiours Obligation to Obedience would be as much concluded as to one place as another, because it related to the Superiours Dominion; and so far as that extended, so far the Inferiours

Obligation to Obedience must extend. This was the sum of what I said, what saith our *Vindicator* to all this?

2. Will he deny the *Major*? I find not a word in his whole Chapter that way. But it is the *Minor* which his loose discourse seemeth to deny, but before he doth it he must again be premising. 1. "That he hath
"before shewed that Mens Ability of Ex-
"pression (which is not properly the Gift
"of Prayer) are not on other accounts ne-
"cessary to be used, unless where they be
"requisite for the better performing the
"Worship of God. What he hath said a-
bout the Gift of Prayer I have answered,
and proved, That an Ability fitly to express
our minds to God in Prayer, is properly the
Gift of Prayer, if we speak (as we do) of
Vocal Ministerial Prayer; For the other part
of this sentence, besides what I have fur-
ther said before to prove them a *Divine*,
Natural, *Proper Mean*, I would again know
of him, whether every man, as to his own
practice, must not be judge of his better per-
forming the *Worship* of God; if he must, he
hath said nothing.

3. As to his premising that he hath before
shewed the usefulness of set Forms in themselves
for the *Publick Offices of Religious Worshipping*. I
have proved that as to Prayer, they cannot
be established, without mans taking up-
on him to appoint one *Essential part* of *Wor-
shipping* in *Vocal Prayer*, which himself deni-
eth man a power to do: I have also proved,
Gods

Gods Institution of another mean, viz. our own Abilities.

4. But he tells us, *That he not founding their lawfulness and expediences meerly upon obedience to Superiors, can be no ways concerned to determine and enquire after the extent or boundaries of the Authority of our Governours in this thing.* But yet I hope we neither being able to see, nor yield any such *usefulness* of them for all *Ministers*, must enquire, whether we be not obliged to the use of them *from the meer command of Superiors*, and if in that thing they be not our *Superiors*, that is, have no power to command, we can have no obligation upon us to obey; nor are any of those great *Topicks* from an *Obligation to Unity and Submission* to be used towards us; for why should not those who are so Zealous for *Forms*, as well unite with us, as we with them, especially considering that *words in Vocal Prayer* are an *Essential part of Worship*, the *Calves of our Lipps*, which must be creatures onely of Gods making. If our *Vindicator* will only argue them *lawful*, because they are *useful*, we are not of that mind: so let it be a *Problematical Question*, but then let not us be railed at as *Schismaticks* and *sinfully disobedient* to *Governours*, who judge them not *lawful*, and so not the object of *Superiors power*.

5. Besides, in so tender a thing as Gods *Worship*; every thing as we can fancy *useful* is not therefore *lawful*. Indeed the *usefulness*

fulness of things in Gods Worship, must be concluded from a *preceeding Prescription of God*. No *Act, Part or Mean of Worship* is useful, which God hath not directed by the Light of Nature or in his Revealed Will.

6. As to what he tells me, p. 194. n. 4. I answer, That no good Christian can yield a *Reverence to Superiors*, where he cannot save his *Reverence to God*, in the first place; and that he cannot do, till he be satisfied, that his *Superior* is his *Superior* in that case; *i. e.* That God hath given him a power to command and to determine him in the case, if it be the Will of God, that another *Mean* should be used in that case. by those that have it; Or if it be the Will of God, that as to any *Act of Worship* a mean should be left to his Peoples liberty as under the Law it was in case of the *Turtle Doves*, or *young Pigeons*, before named. It is no *Reverence* to, but a sinful flattering of Superiors, to tell them by our Tongues, Pens or Practice, that they may appoint such means, as God hath not appointed, or that they may appoint and determine where it is the *Will of God* that his Ministers or People should be left at liberty. And Christians ought not to yield *Principles*, which are improveable against them, to carry them on to further sins.

7. But in the next place he comes to consider, *Whether it be not lawful to forbear Prayers,*

Prayers, (conceived Prayers at least) *before and after Sermons*, he thinks it is. Well then if it be lawful (say our *Conformable Divines*) it may be commanded by Superiors, and such commands ought to be obeyed by *Inferiors*. Then it is true which I said, That Superiors may wholly in Publick Worship suppress the Gift of Prayer.

8. But what shall we say for Families? p. 200, *he thinks a well composed Form may be used in a Family*. I think so too, if he that Ministrereth *hath not the Gift of Prayer*, or if it be a form composed by himself. But the Question is, *Whether Superiors may command the use of such, and no other*. He seemeth to conclude they may, for he determineth them *lawful*, and according to the Principle, That Superiors may command even in the Worship of God *what is lawful*, not what is necessary only; They may also as to Families, suppress the use of our Gift of Prayer, or Ability to express our selves to God in Prayer. So it is granted, that by a Superiors command, *the Exercise of the Ministerial Gift of Prayer may be shut out of all Churches and all Families*; and indeed it is so as to a great many.

9. Well then, may we pray otherwise then by Forms in our *Closet*, admitting Superiors did command us also there to pray only by Forms? He tells us p. 203. *That Forms*

Forms of Prayer are of excellent and singular use in Families and Closets? But p. 202. he tells us as to Closets, *That if any Superior should forbid all such Confessions and Petitions [in Closets] this being against the duty of a Creature and a Christian, ought not to be submitted to.* So then, the Superior in this case is no Superior: But I pray why? Where hath God given the Superior a licence to determine the words of *Vocal Prayer* in one place, more then in another? I am sure it is not in Scripture, and I cannot conceive how it should be in Nature.

10. Our Answerer offers but one thing in reason for it, *Because there are many things concerning the Persons own particular wants, which cannot be comprized in a Form, are needful matters of his private and retired Devotions;* p. 201. Will not the same reason hold for leaving Forms of Prayer at liberty to be used or not used in publick Congregations? What State, what Church almost is there, that every Month hath not some new particular wants, I will not say which cannot be comprized in a Form, but which cannot be comprized in the same Form; and if Forms for the Publick must upon this account be renewed every Moon, why may they not, or should they not, for persons be renewed every night (that is only matter of trouble.)

11. Here's one great evil of *standing Forms*, they cannot provide for the greatest
Emer-

Emergencies. Within these Two years last past, we have had as great issues of Providence, with reference both to our most *Sacred Sovereigns Life, our Religion,* and *Civil Government.* as ever any Nation or Church in the World had: as great things to give God special thanks and great praise for: as great things to begg of God, for our *Bodies, our Souls,* our *Posterity.* What hath there been in all our publick Forms for it? How many Congregations have there been, where God hath not had one Thanksgiving for so great Discovery; or one Prayer imploring him either to avert the dangers feared, or his assistance to our King and Councils for the fuller discovery of the wickedness, and perfecting our deliverence. I believe since Christ had a Church upon the Earth and an interest in any Kingdom. of the Extent of ours, an instance cannot be given, where the *King and Parliament,* unanimously and without any persons contradiction of it, declared,

That they were fully satisfied by the proofs they had heard, that there then was, and for divers years last past had been, an Horrid, and Treasonable Plot, and Conspiracy, contrived and carried on by those of the Popish Religion, for the Murthering of his Majesties Sacred Person, and for subverting the Protestant Religion, and the Ancient and Established Government of the Kingdom.

Which

Which was done both in *October* and *November* 1678, and again *March* 25. 1679.

And God received so few special Praises for our deliverance, or heard so few *Special Petitions* in reference to it, from multitudes of the Ministry of the Nation in their Publick Services; nor indeed could it be helped, considering they were tyed to *Publick Forms*, composed many years before any such thing appeared.

12. Another mischief is this, *That upon publick Emergencies, all Ministers are tyed to such Petitions, as those who make the Forms will prepare, which very little, or nothing at all concern the special providence, and where they concern it, very little, or nothing at all.* How much is God either mocked or deprived of his Glory? We have had so late and famous an Instance, as no more plain one can be. The King and Parliament in Nov. 1678, had declared their full satisfaction as before, and the Parliament applyed themselves to his Majesty for a *Solemn Publick Fast*. His Majesty proclaimed it: 13. Nov. 1678. and in order to it, gave Order for Forms of Prayer proper for it to be made. One Form was made, in which was not any thing new of that nature. This was complained of in *Parliament*. They Voted another *Address*, complaining of it, and desiring some special Forms might be made, taking notice of an *Horrid Popish Plot*, &c. His

His Majesty gave present Order accordingly. A *Second* was made, which came out but 4 or 5 days before the *Fast* day, but time enough to be sent into the Country. But on the *Lords day* a Member of the House complained to the *House of Commons* that in that, there was not one word of *Popish Plots*, &c. upon this the House Voted a third Address to his Majesty about it, his Majesty presently Ordered it, then the words *Popish Plots* came in, but it was too late to send it in that Form all over *England*. We trust the *King* and *Parliament of England* will from hence conclude, how unreasonable a thing it is, to tye up all Ministers to *Publick Forms*. Since that time, how many occasions have been for *special Petitions* and *Thanksgivings*, but in very many (I will not say most) Congregations, God hath lost that acknowledgment of his influence upon *Humane Affairs*, because the Ministers have been tyed to their *Old Forms*. And from hence I doubt not to say, but in a great measure it is, That not a few *Ministers*, and multitudes of *People*, have found no difficulty, either to deny there was any such Plot, or is any, or to lessen it, and turn it to a *ridicule*, or to insinuate that *honest Protestants* were the Plotters. The often repeated Declarations of it by the *King* and *Parliament*, the several Declarations of the *Council*, the proceedings against the Plotters by the *Reverend Judges*,
are

are not enough to make these Men believe a matter of Fact so often proved before them. Let this be in answer to the Provision for particular Emergencies by *Collects*, p. 199. This is enough to have spoken to this Chapter of our *Vindicators*; where the Principles we seem to differ in are,

1. That all Ministers may be lawfully tyed up to Forms of Prayers made by others, in the Church, and all People in their Families; and they are useful for those who have Abilities to Pray in their Closets.
2. That Forms of Prayer for any States and Churches, may be made, comprehending all wants of Churches and States, upon particular Emergences of Providence.

I utterly deny the former, and the latter too, if there be not a renewing of them every Month or Week.

C H A P. VII.

A Reply to what the Vindicator hath said, Chap. 6. p. 206, &c. The Vindicator's great esteem for reading other Mens Sermons instead of Preaching. The tendency of Principles to be considered, before we grant them by our Practice. He hath said nothing cogent to prove that Superiors may

not as well impose Forms of Sermons, as of Prayers. His Notions about Mans power to Spiritual good examined, as also his Notion, as to Justification, and the imputed Righteousness of Christ. How consonant to the Articles of our Church, and those of Ireland. The mischief of the Scheme of Doctrine which he in this matter defends.

1. I laid my fifth Argument thus,
 - “ To agree a Principle,
 - “ which agreed would also Reasonable
 - “ allow a power in man, Acco. p. 98.
 - “ when pleased to suppress
 - “ all Ministerial Gifts in Preaching; is
 - “ sinful.

But to agree, it is lawful for Ministers to obey Man, in performing their Ministerial Acts in Prayer, by the prescribed Forms of other Men, is to agree a Principle which agreed, would allow man a power when he pleased, to suppress all Ministerial Gifts in Preaching. Ergo, The Major is evident upon the Principle before laid down, That it is not in the power of Man to suppress, extinguish or render useless, any Ministerial Gift; for this were to frustrate Christs design in giving them; which was not to be laid up in Napkins, but to be used for the good of Men. Nor will our

An-

Answerer say, that it is lawful for Superiors, to suppress all Ministerial Gifts in Preaching, and tye Ministers only to read other Mens Sermons. He saith p. 211. *It is lawful to cite other Mens Sentences. Or to use a larger Portion of other mens Discourses, owning the Authors.* All this is true, but what is it to the purpose, which is not about sentences and quotations, but about the whole contexure of Sermons.

2. Nay further then this, *It is lawful to read to People whole Sermons, and Homilies;* but this is no Ministerial Act, tho it be a good Action, and the People had better have this means of Instruction then none at all. But every good Action is not a Ministerial Act. By a Ministerial Act, I mean an Act which Christ, or any of his Apostles required of, or directed the Ministers of the Gospel; not that which Christ meant when he commanded his Disciples to go and Preach, nor (as it appears by their Practice) did they so understand it.

3. Our Answerer seems to deny the other Proposition, but for Answer to it, he first referreth to what he premised to his Answer to the former Argument, as to which I shall also refer to my former Answer, only adding this: That whereas out of Reverence to Superiors, he seemed to hint, that we should first stay till any such thing be commanded. The plain English
of

of that is this, *Stay till you have condemned your selves, and shall have nothing to say if such a thing be commanded* (having first granted the Principle on which it is founded) and then *complain*, that is, *When the Steed is stollen, shut the Stable door*; let us first hook you past escaping us without rending your jaws, and then if we catch you and pull you up, complain. Every wise man ought to consider whither his Principles or Practice will carry him, before he alloweth the one, or ingathereth in the other.

3. Next he tells us, *That he hath manifested, the ordinary and constant usefulness of Set Forms in Prayer, in Publick Worship, for the advantage of Religion, if I be able to prove the same concerning the ordinary using the discourses of others in preaching, he hath then, and not till then made the Cases parallel; but this he thinks I never can.* Let me try a little. I remember p. 87, 88, he hath given us a summary of these pretended advantages.

1. *To ascertain the people, that nothing shall be prayed for by the Ministers, but what they can say Amento.* And is it not as great an advantage from Forms of Sermons, that then the People shall hear nothing, but what they may afore-hand consider, and be assured they may by Faith agree to?

2. *That the people might be under no Temptations to give their minds a liberty for ill*

ends to observe Expressions, and the manner of composition of the Prayer. And is it not of as great advantage there should be Forms of Sermons, that Ministers may not have a Temptation to make their Preaching, a business of Rhetorick or of Raillery, or meer Philosophy, which too many have done, and do do: Witness Mr. Hickringill's Curse ye Meroz.

3. That there may be an Unity in Prayer. And is not an Unity of Faith and Doctrine of as much advantage to Religion, as an Union in the words and syllables of our Devotion, and something more too? Might not Forms of Sermons both contribute to, and also testify that?

4. Dull Capacities would be so helped. And are not people ordinarily more dull in comprehending the Mysteries of the Gospel, and the Doctrines thereof, then in understanding the words of a Prayer?

5 To prevent Impertinencies, in advised Expressions, results of Passion, Imprudence, Negligence, Weakness, bad Principles, Erroneous Opinions. Would not Forms of Sermons as much advantage Religion, by preventing all these ten times more orderly in Sermons then in Prayer? Thus I have made the Cases parallel I think. But Divine Institutions we argue without regard to the Will of God as the only Director in the case from such things as we fancy would be advantages of Religion, we do, but set the Sun by the Dial, God knew better

better than we, what would be advantages to Religion: There's no arguing in these cases, but concerning the *Will* of God in the case. They are not our fancied advantages, that will prove the Will of God in these cases.

4. In the next place he tells us, *The Ancient Church appointed Forms of Prayer, but not Forms of Sermons.* Admit this were true, that the *Ancients* for 500 years after Christ did either generally use, or *impose* *Forms* of Prayer, (which I am very far from believing to have any truth in it) and not *Forms* of Sermons; doth this prove that the one is more lawful then the other? Are the Opinions and Practices of Men, things to be urged argumentatively to prove a thing *Lawful* or *Sinful*? They may be urged indeed to put us upon a strict Enquiry, but no further. I may consider these differences, when I believe the thing is true in matter of fact; but I shall never so consider them, if I knew the thing was true, as to determine lawfulness, or sin from them.

5. *But Preaching is directed to Men* (therefore there must be no imposing *Forms* as to that) but *Prayer to God* (therefore *Forms* may be appointed as to that.) Can any Mortal understand, why there should be more care taken, what a Minister speaketh in *mans name unto God*, then in *Gods Name unto Man*? Hath not an Embassador more reason to take care what he speaketh

eth in the Princes name unto People, then what, and how he speaketh, in ordinary Petitioners name unto his Prince? But Men may be taken with *varying of Phrases*, but God cannot. But God may be pleased to hope with the doing of his Will, and by the exercises of those Abilities in his Service, which he hath given us on purpose for that Service; and it speaketh no great Reverence for God, for any to expresse these things by the Puerile expression of *Varying Phrases*.

6. The next thing he saith p. 208, is very admirable, That *Erroneous Notions and Practices, cannot be so well beaten down by Forms, as by every Ministers Abilities*. This is to say that Errors may be better confuted, and Arguments for them better answered by any Ministers private Conceptions and Expressions on a small premeditation, then by a Book or Forms, deliberately by many composed and written; for Forms may be made every Month of this nature, if they be lawful and necessary.

7. He tells us thirdly, p. 209. That *by leaving men to the use of their own abilities, in Preaching, Ministers may acquaint People with such things as are suitable to them, and in a Phrase suitable*: It is much, that he could not consider also, that if Ministers were left to pray by their own Abilities, they might also pray to God for such things as new *Emergencies* make need-
ful

ful for them ; which they can never do by *Forms*, except they were renewed every Week. And surely God never left his Church so ill provided for, that if at any time he bestowed a *new Mercy* upon them, or the particular Members of any particular Congregation, either preventing or removing some great *Evil*, or conferring some great benefit, or by his Providence brought them into some great distress, they could not obey his command, calling upon him in the day of *Affliction*, that they might be delivered ; nor being delivered praise him, till a *Council* was called to make a *Collect* for the purpose.

8. Our *Vindicators* next difference, or further need of *Forms of Prayer* then of *Sermons assigned by him* is, Because in publick Prayers, must be comprehended *Adoration*, *Thanksgiving*, and *Supplication*, for all ordinary good things, 1 Tim. 2. 1, 2. (what he means here by *Adoration*, as a part of *Worship*, distinct from *Confessions*, *Supplications*, and giving of *Thanks*, I cannot imagine, the Apostle 1 Tim. 2. 1. speaks of nothing but *Supplication*, *Prayers*, *Intercessions*, *Thanksgivings*. I hope he doth not mean bowing at the Name of Jesus, or towards the *Altar*, for they are neither of them mentioned, 1 Tim. 2. 1, 2. For such things indeed, there is need, (yet not so much of *Forms of Prayer*, as) of a *Rubrick* ; for there is nothing about them,

In Albo S. Scripturae. — He saith to secure this *Comprehensiveness*, there is need of *publick Forms*. But it is no way (he saith) needful that every *Sermon* should contain all the necessary points of *Doctrine* and *Practice*. Now here all the *Fallacy* lies in the term *every Sermon*, for there is the same need of one as of the other, but not indeed in every *Sermon*. But how doth this prove, that there is no need of *Forms of Sermons*? Suppose that in a thousand such forms there might be all comprehended, were it lawful for the *Superiors* to impose them? Or *Ministers* to use them, when all *Ministerial Gifts* in *Preaching* must necessarily be so supprest? He seems to think it is; for his next words have a scurvy hint, that the contrary *liberty* is but *indulged* to comply with the *humour and temper of the present age*: And he saith much more in his 6 and 7 Paragraphs p. 210, 211, in commendation of *instructing people by Set Forms*, as a *Ministerial Act*.

9. He is not pleased, p. 212, that I should call *Preaching* the *greatest Ordinance of the Gospel*, or from the *Commissioners* at the *Savoy* tell him, That *Preaching* is a *speaking in Gods Name* unto *People*, so that if we *speake falshoods* there we *make God a liar*. I must confess (so dull was I) that I did say so; for if that be not, what is? *Preaching* is the *publishing of the great glad tidings of the Gospel, to the Children of Men*. It was *Christs great work*, for he left *Baptizing* to his *Disciples*,

Disciples, and himself Baptized none *John 4. 2.* and St. Paul tells us, *1 Cor. I. 17.* That Christ sent him not to Baptize, but to Preach the Gospel, that is, the administration of the Sacraments was not his principal work, for he tells us there *v. 14. 16.* That he did Baptize Crispus, and Gaius, and the household of Stephanas, and *v. 21.* he tells us, that Preaching is Gods Ordinance to save them that believe, and *Rom. 10. 14.* How shall they believe on him of whom they have not heard, and how shall they hear without a Preacher? Is there any such things spoken of any other Ordinance of the Gospel? Or are there any other greater things, then saving of Souls to be expected from any Religious Institution? And to speak Untruths in Preaching is (as much as in us lieth) to make God a liar, for it is a speaking to People in the name of the great God. The Commissioners at the Savoy it is like, understood as much as our Vindicator what Preaching was, and whether our Vindicator be of their mind or no, signifieth not much. I must confess from some Mens Sermons which I have heard and read, I have seen reason to suspect, that they, and others. have had a vastly different Notion of Preaching from us. The Noncon. generally (and very many Conformists too) looking upon it as a great Institution of Christ, for the publication of the Grace of Christ and perswading Men to the acceptance of that Grace, to Re-

penitance, Faith, and Holiness, without which none can be saved. Accordingly they have preached Scripturally, and proved from thence what they say, and the bent of their Sermons is to perswade Men to a life worthy of the Gospel, to *Acts of Morality*, out of a Principle of Faith in Christ, Love to God, &c. Others looking upon it, as a meer Exercise of Wit, or an entertainment for peoples ears, or an opportunity to discharge their lusts and passions, have call'd a *flaming piece of Oratory*, a Lecture out of *Aristotles Ethicks*, or *Plato* or such a discourse as lately was made before my Lord Mayor (to the admiration of all men, *Preaching*; which is just such *Preaching* as before the Reformation, the people had from the *Po-pish Priests*, whose *Preaching* was but a Lecturing out of *Scorus* and *Aquinas*, or a story out of the *Legend*, and (as the story of that age tells us) they had not onely the brutish impudence to do this, but also to Petition Magistrates for a liberty to do it, when the common people discerned the folly and madness of it, and would no longer endure to be so abused and de-luded.

10. In his 214 p. he groweth very angry, that I should say,

How many discourses of late years have we had in Pulpits, pretending to prove Men have a natural power, to things Spiritually good. That we are not justified, by the

the imputed Righteousness of Christ, but by our own works? How many perfect Satyres, Raillerys, and Evocations of the Lusts and Choler in the Preachers hearts. To this he subjoyneth,

These are the kind words, and meek Expressions of one who judgeth and censures the sharpness of other Men. Then he comes to defend those who have spoken for Mens Natural power, to Spiritual Acts, and against the imputed Righteousness of Christ. These things must not pass unexamined.

11. Will our Answerer say there have been no such discourses of late years? I appeal to thousands, and ten thousands of Witnesses. Will he say, *Ab*, but they should not have been spoken of, because they reflect on the Ministry of our Church. That is false, they reflect not on the Ministry, tho upon many Ministers of our Church, or who call themselves so. The Ministry of our Church are those who Preach according to the Doctrine of our 39 Articles (which these Doctrines are not) others are but Intruders, whom our Church owneth not; they are but our Churches Natural Sons. Our Church hath declared against them, in her Articles and Homilies.

12. Besides, did not our Answerer inforce me to what I spake, he had before often told us, of the Impertinencies, Errors, Nonsense, Blasphemy, to which conceived Prayer gave a scope, and That a Prayer may be put up, and the People could

Reasonable Account p. 106.

not joyn in one Petition. I told him, That was a rare and an hard case. 2. That their not joyning might be from the Lusts and Error of their own Hearts; 3. That it was the same case as to *Preaching*, and therefore the Argument was as strong for *Forms of Sermons* to be *Universally imposed and used*. He told me there had been many such Prayers: I told him there had been also many such Sermons. But must our *Vindicator*, who knows this, plead for it too, as he doth now to the end of this Chapter. p. 215, 216. Let us hear what he saith.

13. He tells us that all our Ministers own *Christ to be the Saviour of the World* (so did Pelagius) and that the *New Covenant of Grace is confirmed through him* (so did he for ought I ever heard; or read) and that in this day of Grace God gives his Aids and Assistances, besides the Instructions of his Word, the mighty motives of his Gospel, and the benefits of the Ministry of Reconciliation, and his Holy Sacraments. Hold here a lirtle, for here lieth the pinch. What doth our *Vindicator* mean by Aids, Helps, and Assistances, besides the Instructions of the Word, and Motives of the Gospel, &c. doth he mean any more then the Remonstrants have in their confession 1622 thus expressed, Chap. 17. n. 8.

“That the Holy Spirit gives to all, and
“every Man to whom the word of Faith
“is

“is ordinarily preached, so much Grace;
 “or is ready to give so much, as is suffi-
 “cient for the begetting of Faith.—— If
 he meaneth no more by those terms, then
 this, he meaneth no more then a *common*
Grace, granted unto all men that are in the
 Church; and tho this indeed be more then
 a *Natural Priviledge*, yet I do not under-
 stand how it is more then a *Natural Power*
 under the *advantage* of those *Priviledges*.
 For *Natural* here is opposed to *Adventitious*,
 and such adventitious assistance, as is more
 then the improvement of *meer natural A-*
ilities, by *ordinary and common Means*.
 Which improvements, we commonly call
 The *common Gifts or Grace of the Holy Spi-*
rit. All these are comprehended under the
 term of a *Natural Power*, and are opposed
 to *Spiritual*, which here signifies the
 mighty workings of the Spirit of God,
 in a way of *special and distinguishing Grace*,
 inabling the Soul to do some *truly Spirit-*
ual Acts, which it cannot do (without
 the *Assistances*) either from the powers of
meer Nature, or *improved Nature*, but must
 be done from a Soul *changed*, born again
 of the *Spirit*, *renewed*, *transform-*
ed, &c.

14. I am sorry to read our *Answerer* de-
 claring, That he cannot understand the *End*
of Preaching, unless a man under no *speci-*
al Circumstances differencing him from none
 who lives within the Church, hath a power
 to *believe and work out his own Salvation*,
 and

and to live Godlily , Righteously , and Soberly. I am sure no man can truly believe what he hath no sufficient Evidence of the truth of; and our Saviour told Peter Flesh and Blood had not given him a sufficient Evidence. That Christ was the Son of the Living God. Matth. 16. 17. But what our Author saith, is the Arminians Argument, and hath been sufficiently answered in multitudes of Books; and what our Vindicator saith, is confuted by the experience of many good Christians, who will own the quite contrary; and I am sure the Church of England saith in her 10th Art, *We have no power to do good works pleasing and acceptable to God, without the Grace of God by Christ preventing us that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will.* And Art 13. *Works done before the Grace of Christ, and the Inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasing to God, because they spring not of Faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make men meet to deserve Grace.*

15. As to the point of Justification, our Author saith thus :

“ We disclaim every where merit in our
 Vindication “ own works (so do the Socini-
 “ ans) and acknowledge, that
 p. 217. “ our Saviour hath as our Me-
 “ diator interposed by his O-
 “ bedience, Righteousness, and Sacrifice, to
 “ expiate our sins, give the Sanction to
 “ the New Covenant of Grace, and Righte-
 “ ousness,

"reousness, and to assure the Mercy of
 "God, and Pardon, and Forgiveness, upon
 "the Terms of it. But if we speak of the
 "Gospel condition of Justification, that
 "must be performed by our selves; and
 "we do account, that as Repentance which
 "includes (that I dare say he meant not
Excludes as it is Printed though he hath
 not been so charitable to me, as to think
 I meant the Opinion and Practice, not the
 Person of *Gregory* the great, was protect-
 ed by *Charles* the great) is a necessary con-
 "dition to the obtaining of Pardon of Sin,
 "so consequently it is necessary to our
 "being justified: ——— Nor shall I examine
 (tho I cannot find it out) the sense of the
 next words, but take him up again, where
 I do understand what he meaneth. ———
 "And that a renewed *Holy Life* is necessary
 "to Justification, is manifested from that
 "wrath, and threatening denounced against
 "workers of Iniquity, yet he tells us, p:
 "218. That the Gospel Justification is
 "through the Redemption of our Saviour
 "and Faith in him, and from the benefit
 of his Sacrifice. ———

"But it cannot be that the Righteousness
 "of Christ should be so imputed to us, as
 "that we should be looked upon as having
 "done or suffered what he did, or suffer-
 "ed, ——— for then we should be looked
 "upon as Mediators, ——— and might be
 "invoked. ——— And he can see no other
 "blame in this Doctrine, then that it is
 "consistent

"consistent with it self, and with what
 "was delivered by the Apostle.

16. I will begin my Answer with the
 11th Article of our Church, "*We are ac-*
 "counted Righteous before God, only for
 "the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus
 "Christ by Faith, and not for our own
 "works or deservings; wherefore that we
 "are justified by faith only is a most whole-
 "some Doctrine, and very full of com-
 "fort. — and that they may not say that
 "by Faith is understood Works, or a Practi-
 "cal Assent. Faith in the two next Articles
 is made the Spring and Fountain of all good
 Works.

The Articles of the Church of Ireland
 are yet more plain, Artic. 34, 35, 36, 37.
 I shall only mention one clause Art.

34.
 "This Righteousness which we receive
 "of Gods Mercy, and Christs Merits,
 "embraced by Faith (which Faith
 "Artic. 37 they declare to be a par-
 "ticular Application of the Promises
 "of the Gospel, to the comfort of
 "our Souls, whereby we lay hold on
 Christ, &c.) is taken, accepted and
 "allowed of by God, for our perfect
 "and full Justification.

17. Our Answerer knew well enough
 that by *imputed Righteousness* we did never
 understand, that the *Acts or Sufferings* of
 Christ as *Mediator* were imputed, so as to
 make them as if we had done them. This

(Reader

(Reader) is juſt ſuch another Argument, as if a Prince ſhould employ his *Embaffadour* to pay a *Redemption Price* for an 100 Slaves at *Algiers*, and he ſhould do according to his Commiſſion; and when he had done, ſome learned *Muffelman*, ſhould come to prove that the *Embaffadors* Action in Payment of the *Ranſome*, could not be reckoned his, or as if *he had done it*, becauſe he was a *Mediator* for an 100, neither did he actually pay the money. Certainly the Slave would tell him, that his *Action*, ſo far as concerned him, might notwithstanding be *imputed* to him, that is reckoned as if it had been his Action.

18. But it may be this is but a *word-bait* a conteſt *De Lana Caprina*, it may be what they grant is enough to expreſs the end of *Chriſts coming into the World*, the *Mercy of God in Chriſt*, and to ſecure the *Salvation of Souls*. Doth he think ſo? I would gladly then have him answer theſe Questions, *Whether the Righteous Lord can clear the Guilty without a ſatisfaction given to his Juſtice*, contrary to *Exod. 34. 7*. If a ſatisfaction muſt be given, for every Mans ſin, to make him in a capacity to be declared *Righteous* (that is juſtified) before God, who could ever ſatisfie but Chriſt? 3. Whether this ſatisfaction (which we call *Chriſts Righteouſneſs*) could ever be ours, without a gracious *Act of God* ſo reckoning it, as if we our ſelves had made it? Whether, there fore

therefore it be possible that the Righteousness, whereby any Soul can be in any capacity to be declared *Righteous by God*, should be any other then the *Righteousness of Christ*, and any Righteousness of our own, can possibly be antedecedaneous to our *Justification*?

19. In the mean time, we grant that God pardoneth no Souls Sins, but theirs in whom he hath wrought so much Repentance, as lies in a *Resolution through his Grace to leave sin and to do good*; but this may be separated from all *Actual good works*, and is no more then an *habit of Sanctification* which God gives at the same time, that he *justifieth the Soul*, but he doth not for that justify the Soul. That is very far from the *Righteousness* for which God in this life, declareth any Soul Righteous, and pardoneth its Sin. It is true, no Soul in the day of Judgment shall be justified, but that Soul, that hath wrought *Righteousness*; and every Soul which hath in sincerity done that, tho not in a legal perfection, shall be acquitted from guilt by vertue of the Covenant of Grace, founded upon the satisfaction of Christ, who in this sense is called, *The Lamb slain from the Foundation of the World*.

20. Nor is the contrary Opinion (so finely blended by our *Vindicator*) so harmless, as he would make it, much less so consonant with the Apostles Doctrine. 1. It makes *Justification* a meer Act of Grace, which the Scripture makes also an act of *Justice*
and

and Righteousness in God; Rom. 3. 25, 26: To declare his Righteousness, for the Remission of sins, to declare I say his Righteousness, that he might be just, and the Justifier of him who believeth in Jesus. 2. It gives Christ no place in Mans Redemption, but that of establishing a Covenant upon which God might exercise his Grace. It indeed talks of his Redemption and Merit, but takes away the work of a Redeemer, and maketh his Merits needless. 3. It maketh Faith, as it is an Application of the Soul to his Righteousness and Merit, needless, tho the Scripture makes an inseparable connexion betwixt it and Salvation. Hence it is very rarely that we hear the necessity of such Faith urged. 4. It gives man the principal parts in his Justification, for they are his works for which God justifieth, tho indeed it be upon the account of a Covenant established by the Blood of Christ. Much more might be said: In short, it alloweth Christ to be a great Prophet, a great Benefactor to Man-kind, but denies him to be a True Priest, such a one as atones by Blood; he onely doth it by Mediation, Intercession, and a Covenant. According to this Doctrine, his Blood onely sealed a Covenant; in what sense they call his Death a Sacrifice, they know best.

21. In the mean time, no sober persons deny good works their due place; without them no Soul shall be justified in the great day. They are necessary to Salvation, and

M

that

that final *Justification*. *Ambsdorfius* is the only Protestant I have met with; who indeed in one place denies them to be necessary to *Salvation*; no valuable person hath since (that I know of) approved his wild saying. But they have no place in the *justification of a Soul in this Life*, unless in the *Justification of its Faith*, to be true, and not counterfeit. And a Soul may be declared Righteous before God, and have its sins pardoned, before it hath actually done any good works, tho not before it be prepared by God for them by a *disposition wrought by Gods holy Spirit in the heart*, and a *resolution to do them*; which is indeed *Repentance in the Seed*, but such a Seed as must necessarily afterwards produce its Fruit. For it is as impossible any Soul should truly trust and hope in Christ for that Eternal Life which he hath only promised to an Holy Life, and not live such a life; as it is that a man or woman should truly trust and hope in a rich man for an Estate, without doing the things to the performance of which he hath made the promise; which is even naturally impossible for any to do, tho they may pretend to it.

C H A P. VIII.

A Reply to what the Vindicator hath said, Chap. 7. p. 219, &c. The Vindicator will not understand, that the Question was at first stated only as to Vocal Prayer, nor speak to the thing in difference. Two Errors running through all the Vindicators Book. He hath brought no sufficient Reasons, for a different Interpretation of the Divine Precepts for Prayer and Preaching. He trifletb in applying what I said as to Reading to a recitation of anothers words, tho it be without Reading. The impertinent ways of modern Answerers; the Vindicator too much followeth them.

I N the 7th Chap. p. 219. Our Vindicator comes to Answer my Sixth Argument, which I had thus laid down :

To pretend to perform an Act of Worship, and yet not Reasonable to do it at the same time, Acc. p. 115. is sinful.

But for Ministers furnished by God with the Gift of Prayer, to perform their Mini-

sterial Acts in Prayer, by the prescribed Forms of others, is to pretend to the performance of an Act of Divine Worship, and at the same time not to do it. Ergo,

The Major I conceived needed no proof, for to do such a thing were but to mock God, and to deceive our own Souls. The Minor I proved, 1. Because we so interpret the precept for Preaching, not Go read other Mens Sermons. 2. If he read such Prayers. I said it was a further question, because in all languages the words used to express Reading are different from those used to express Praying. I said we laid a greater stress upon other Arguments than upon this yet we could not think this vain and impertinent. I said at first, That the question is not about Prayer in the general, but about Vocal Prayer, p. 115. again p. 117. We are speaking of Vocal Prayer, and what is the Will of God relating to that species of Prayer.

2. In our *Vindicators Chapter* relating to this Argument, two things are considerable; 1. The Answer. 2. The Reflections that have nothing of an Answer in them. I shall only inform my Reader, that it may appear by the Title of my Book, and by the conclusion of it, and by many passages in it, that I did not pretend in this case to define, but only to argue; not to determine what is lawful and unlawful for all Men, in it self, absolutely, but to give our Reasons, why we judge this thing unlawful: leaving others

others to the conduct of their own Consciences. Nor had I done this, if the World had not been so often, and so impudently told, That we grant these things *lawful*, That *we have no reasons*, nothing to say (Wisdom, Reason, and Learning, were all born with them, and with them alone they must dwell and dye.) Now these things being first called to mind, let us hear what our Answerer saith to the *Argument*.

3. First he saith, *This is an heavy Charge*, a false *Accusation*, a *Slander*, a *Calumny*; but whom doth it accuse? Not a person in the World. Do I, giving my Argument why I so judge a thing unlawful, condemn others, who think the same thing *lawful*, especially when I profess against it? p. 164. n. 2. Next he saith, *I contradict my self*, having granted before, *Forms in themselves lawful*, and *may lawfully be used by Ministers in some cases*. Very prettry, and I contradict my self (forsooth) because I now say, that I think it unlawful for *Ministers furnished with the Gift of Prayer*, and in a *capacity to use it*, *nothing naturally hindring*. I would gladly know in what degree of opposition these *Propositions* are. Shall we continually be troubled with Arguments, *Ex ignoratone Elenchi*, not concluding against the Question, or to whom do such Arguments signifie any thing? Let the Reader see the Question stated p. 5.

4. But at length our Vindicator thinks he shall speak to the point, telling us, That there is not the same reason to interpret the precept of Preaching, as the precepts for Prayer. Very good, why did not he say so at first; I do think there is, how doth he prove there is not? He saith (instead of every precept is to be interpreted) every duty is to be performed, suitably to the Nature of the Duty it self, or in such a manner as may best tend to the pleasing of God, and the exercise of true Piety. Very true, it being always understood, that those things best please God, and are the truest exercises of Piety, which are according to his will. For to talk in matters of External Worship, of any thing pleasing to God, being an Exercise of Piety, or any vertue in them antecedent to, or separate from the Divine Will, is very odd discourse. God hath not willed acts in External Worship, because they are good and pious, but because he hath willed them, therefore they are so.

But he tells us, That in Publick Prayer, Religious Devotion and Gracious Dispositions and Desires towards God, are the great things to be practised, and so that the use of a Form is well accommodated. I suppose he means for all Ministers, for otherwise he saith nothing.

8. We are speaking (as I said at first) not of Prayer in the general, but of Vocal Prayer of which (as I have proved) words are an Essential Part; and being so, our
Author

Author hath told us , *None but God can institute* what words we shall use. If he hath appointed any *Forms* of this Nature, they are therefore *lawful* and best, because he hath appointed them. If he hath left us some, but not commanded us to use them; but leaving us at liberty to use them, or others to that sense; Man can no more determine, then in the case of the *Turtle Doves* or young *Pigeons*. If he hath only *Instituted words as a part of Vocal Prayer*, but left it to the liberty of his Ministers what words to use, only requiring them to ask nothing contrary to his *Revealed Will*; it is not in the *Creatures* power to determine to another what words he should use.

6. Two *Errors* and no small ones. I have observed running through all our *Vindicators Book*. He seems not to allow of *Vocal Prayer* to be a distinct *species* of Prayer, from what is *meerly Mental*, which it must be, or it would be sufficient for a Minister in the publick Congregation to Pray Mentally, and 2. Prayer would be no Homage of our Lipps, and outward man. And if it be, there is something else required to it, besides *Gracious Dispositions* and *Desires towards God*, viz. *Audible words*, and they must be an *Essential part* of it, as being that which alone distinguisheth it from the other *Species*.

7. Secondly, Our Author all along this discourse; seemeth to talk of a *Piety* and *Devotion* in *External Worship*, antecedent

neous to the *Will of God* revealed concerning that *Worship*. Hence he thinks to conclude *Forms according to the Will of God*, because (in his opinion) they tend to promote *Piety and Devotion*, yea and pleads these things in barr to our proof, that *It is the Will of God that his Ministers who have the Gift of Prayer, or an Ability fitly to express their minds to God in Prayer, should use that Gift in Praying*. We think that that Duty in External *Worship* which is performed most strictly according to the *Will of God*, is performed with most *Devotion and Piety*; otherwise the *Papists* have more to say for their *Images* then I think they have.

8. But he further addeth, *That Ministers are to teach People what they before understood not*. This is in part true, but this is not half their work in *Preaching*. *We are not to acquaint God in Prayer with what he before knew not*. Therefore the precept for *Preaching* may not be interpreted *go and read another Mans Sermon*; but the Precept for *Prayer* may be interpreted, *go read another Mans Prayer*. We cannot indeed in *Prayer* tell God what he is not acquainted with: But how doth it therefore follow that therefore we must not interpret the precept of God as to Ministerial *Prayer*, *Go, and study the Mind and Will of God, and according to the Abilities I have given you, express your and others thoughts to me, as to the things which are according*

to my *Will* ; seeing it may be done by words conceived in our own hearts , and I have proved them most *Natural* , most proper and very probably the *Will of God* ; and considering words are an *Essential part of this Worship* which no Man can institute or determine , if Gods Word hath left the particular words to our liberty , and that the matter of Prayer is more variable then of Sermons ?

9. I had said p. 118, *That the words in both Languages in Scripture used to express Reading, are quite other, from those used to express our duty in Prayer.* — In the same page I had repeated the same: *We will not be too confident of it. but we are not aware of any Text in the Old Testament where* *℣* *signifieth that kind of Speech ; which is but the recitation or repetition By Reading of the words of others.* Either the Printer , or perhaps my self carelessly (having plainly expressed my mind before , in the first lines of that Paragraph) left out those words , *by Reading* , which manifestly was my sense , as appears from what I laid down at first and was proving. I had also said , *That the Hebrews had a great penury of words* , and it was hard to establish an Argument from proper and significant words in that language. But I did not remember any text in which *℣* is translated *Read*. Here he mightily triumphs over my unhappiness in *Critical Observations* ; nor do I much pretend to them , or affect them , but yet shall

shall tell him that *ῥω* in the three Texts he hath brought Gen. 32. 4. Deut. 26. 5. Deut. 27. 14. cannot be proved to signifie Reading, which is that I undertook to prove p. 118. n. 3. For the *Greek words* it is plain. Here he cryeth out *what meanest he?* That which our *Vindicator* had no mind to understand, and which I plainly enough exprest. That the *Greek words* signifying to read are never used to express the *Action of Prayer*, but instead of them words that signifie a recitation of a thing, without the help of our eyes. Instanced in *ἀγιον*, as *Exegetical* (in part) to *προσούχασθαι*. Now where shall we find that word signifying to read in Scripture *ἀναγιγνώσκω* and *ἀναγιγνώσκω* we may find, but all this referred to the *Reading of Forms*, and touched not the pronouncing of them by heart. I do not think an Argument from words and the usages of them alone conclusive; but it is not so slight as our Author would have it, *Quæ non profunt singula, juncta juvant.*

10. I have done with what in this Chap. pretends to an *Answer*. I come now to consider the *Reflexive part* of it, and indeed this is the way of answering in these Cases, 1. To look if any words can be caught at, to suggest the Adversaries Irreverence or Disobedience to Superiors. 2. Next if any can be found to bring the Adversaries under Odium, or Envy or Prejudice of any multitude. 3. If any lapses of Pen,

or

or otherwise can be found to make the Author appear *Ignorant, Silly, Self contradicting, Unlearned*. 4. To put the *Ergo* before the premises, beginning with telling the Reader, there's no weight, no strength in the Authors Arguments; they are slight, trivial, trifling, inconclusive things, *Quod erat demonstrandum*; which ought to have been the conclusion, after a good answer had been given to the premises. Our Answerer is too much guilty of it, as hath appeared all along in his Discourse in this Chapter.

11. He first entitleth his Chapter, *Praying by Forms is very rashly and injuriously charged with mocking of God*. There is no such thing in my Argument as the term *mocking of God*, nor is it named but in proof of my Major. 2. Nor doth it refer to any but Ministers who have *Abilities* to express themselves fitly to God without them. 3. Nor is it asserted, but as the *private opinion* of some Ministers not satisfied in the use of them, and a reason (and that of which they were least confident of the strength of) why they cannot judge it lawful. And the same Men tell you, p. 264. n. 2. They take not themselves to be *Infallible*, they onely speak as they believe, condemning none that judge or practise otherwise. But this was a fit title to expose the Author by.

12. Next he tells the World this was an *heavy Charge and Accusation*, tho no single person

person was charged, only a private opinion declared. Then the *Reader* is told this is a *trifling* Argument, and the *Reader* must be asked pardon for giving him the trouble to peruse a thing so very inconsiderable (he should have said in my opinion, for he is not infallible) as this. Lastly he must be told of great swelling words, extravagancy enough, words supported, or not supported by weak, feeble, and impotent Arguments. That is, such as our *Vindicator* thinks (and it is his interest to think) such.

C H A P. IX.

A Reply to what the Vindicator hath said, Chap. 8. p. 225, &c. Ministers main work, described in their Commission. The Priests and Levites work, more then the Vindicator owns. They were a whole Tribe in Israel. Their maintenance proportionable. No arguing from Gods appointments under the Law. The Vindicators dirt thrown on the Author, wiped off, himself rebuked, for calling an Ability to express our selves fitly to God in Prayer, a Varying of Phrases. A fear suggested, lest by it he should have vil-

vilified Gods Holy Spirit. 4 New Arguments against the Universal Use, or Imposition of Forms of Prayer.

1. **M**Y Seventh Argument was thus stated,

That Principle, which levelleth the performance of the great and sacred Office of the Ministry, to the capacity of the meanest of the People, cannot be a true Principle.

But this Principle, That it is lawful for a Minister of the Gospel ordinarily to perform his Ministerial Acts in Prayer, by the prescribed Forms of others, doth this. — Ergo.

This I proved p. 121, 122. I first presumed it would be granted that God had appointed an order of Men in his Name to declare his Will unto his people, and to intercede with God on their behalf. 2. That he would not have done it, if they had nothing to do, but what any of the people might do. 3. That any who could read well might read printed Forms. 4. That it is not probable, that God would have reserved Honour or Maintenance, and by a Law established it, for such a kind of Ministry. What saith our Vindicator?

2. He answereth by five Observations. His first is, *That I have given a very defective description of the business of the Ministry.* Indeed I should have put in administering the Sacra-

Sacraments, but let it be added, and then I think I have a good Authority for it, from the Commission given them, *Matth. 28. 19. Go, teach all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, Teaching them to observe all things which I have commanded you, and lo I am with you always to the end of the World.* Here Teaching and Administring the Sacraments, are made their great work, for that both the Sacraments are there included is plain, from the precept *Do this in remembrance of me,* given them *Chap. 26.* We will also grant Prayer from the Apostles Authority, *1 Tim. 2. 3.*

3. He tells us p. 226. *It must be their Exercise of a special power of Office,* that is the doing the same things, but in another notion (as Officers) but were we speaking of the Material or formal part of *their Works?* we were speaking of *what Ministers are to do;* not under what Notion, Character, or Capacity. So I say, take their Material Actions (supposing such Forms lawful) they have no more to do, then the meanest of the people have a Natural power to do; which is all I asserted.

4. Who denies that these Acts done by persons called of God, to do them in his Church, are quite of another vertue and efficacy then as done by persons not so called of God; but my Argument was, *That it is not probable, or to us it appears not probable (for the pretended demonstrations,*

strations, doubtless, and certainties of others in such cases, are no more then confidences) That God would have instituted an Office for the doing of such Acts as the meanest people might do.

5. He tells us p. 227, That his work is also to *Preach* (but in the Argument *Forms of Sermons* were supposed as lawful as *Forms of Prayer*, and I have largely answered what our *Vindicator* hath said, to prove more need of the one, then of the other.) For the other things he mentioneth, dispensing *Abolution* and *Remission*, guiding *Mens Consciences*, directing and obliging men to observe due *Rules* and *Exercises of Repen- tance*, convincing *Adversaries*, watching over their *Flocks*; By his leave, if we either be guided by the practice of Christ or his *Apostles*, considering them as things distinct from *Preaching*, they are the least works of a Minister (I am sure some of them are least attended:) Private satisfactions of *Mens Consciences*, is the work of a Minister, but no piece of his publick servie, (about which we were speaking) nor what a private Christian may not do to his Ability. Nor do I think that in those works a Minister doth any thing *Arbitrarily*, nor that his *Counsels* or *advice* will be found a jot more effectual, then he can make it appear that what he saith is the Will of God.

6. In his third Observation he tells us. That when *Latuer* was laid aside in England,

mann

many of the meanest of the people, both of mean Abilities, and of bad and erroneous principles, were thought fit to be taken into the Ministry, yet could Pray, and Preach popular Sermons in my method and to great satisfaction. What is this to the purpose? comparisons are odious, and it is too true that in the late times too many such persons Prayed and Preached in Publick, but that there were more admitted into the Ministry then since, will be very hard to prove. I could tell him stories enough of my own personal knowledge to make him excuse those admissions into the Ministry which were in those times. But then I should be exclaimed against by our *Vindicator* as a great *Slanderer* of the Church of England, though I know (if our *Vindicator* doth not) that the Bishops cannot help it. We desired to mourn for, and to throw out in those times any *fottish Persons*, that by their Hypocrisie in those times crept into the Ministry, when they once appeared so, we never called them the Brethren or our Brethren, but look'd upon them as the Scabs and Deformity of the Church. For their Abilities, there was no defect of Tryal of them in any Presbyterian Ordinations, that hath been amended since. There were none then ordained but were examined of their skill in Greek and Latine and Hebrew (if they had any, otherwise they solemnly ingaged to study it) in Church History, a great part of the Body of Divinity: none, but were put to make

make a *position* in Divinity, and then to defend it against the Arguments of several learned Men. Let us therefore hear no more of that.

7. Our *Vindicator* p. 231, 232, 233, 234 spends many words to prove that God did under the Law annex a great and honourable Revenue to those that were his Officers, tho their work was none other, then what other persons had a natural capacity to do. But 1. How doth he prove that the Priests ordinary work was nothing else, but to offer *Incense* and *Sacrifices*. They were to Teach, *Micah* 3. 11. Their Lipps were to keep knowledge, *Mal.* 3. 6. They were to resolve Questions concerning the Law, *Hag.* 2. 11. But further let it be considered,

1. That Gods Provision for the Priests, was a Provision for a whole Tribe in Israel. The Males of the Levites only at the first settlement, as appears from *Num.* 3. were near 22000 Men, besides Women, and Children under a Month old, they cannot reasonably be thought much less then 50000 Souls, besides the Priests.

2. It was not reasonable that their Maintenance should be less then was assigned to the other Tribes: but more, because they were taken off from other means of livelihood.

3. Their employment took up their full time.

I will not examine how great it was,
N but

but doth our Answerer think that it is a good Argument to conclude (if he could do it) that because God under the *legal dispensation* allotted a great Maintenance to persons meerly for doing what any ordinary people could have done (which yet is not so) and because they were one of the Tribes of *Israel*, no otherwise provided for; that therefore under the Gospel, where that Worship is wholly altered, and a new *Worship* instituted, for one part of which the great Apostle cries out, *Who is sufficient*, that God should erect a particular Order of Men, and lay such severe charges upon them, *to give attendance to Reading, Exhortation, and Doctrine, not to neglect their Gift, to Meditate on Divine things, and give themselves up wholly to them, to take heed unto their Doctrine, to Preach the Word, to be instant in Season and out of Season, to Reprove, Rebuke, Exhort, to make Intercessions, Supplications, Prayers, and to give Thanks for all Men, &c.* That he should give so strict Rules for their Qualifications, that they should be *able*, as well as *faithful*, before the Office was committed to them. *Apt to teach, &c.* and that these men should have no work to do, or the main work they had to do at least, should be no more, then the most of their people might do? Will that *Maxime*, The Labourer is *worthy of his Hire*, the *Workman of his Wages*, prove that those who do no work in the Ministry, should have Wages?

But

But of this enough , and more than enough.

8. I had instanced in one thing more, viz. *The Unblest Effects* we had seen, of an *Universal practice of this Nature*. The first was, *The filling the Church with an ignorant sottish, and lazy Ministry*. The second was *The loss of Ministerial Gifts and Abilities*. The third was (a consequent at least) --- *A flood of Iniquity*. As to the two first I acknowledged , that we have very many learned, diligent, holy Men, that yet use *Liturgies*. I added, *Far be it from us to say or think otherwise*. But I said, *The establishing of Forms of Prayer for Universal use, opens a door for such persons to enter in. --- And while such a door is open, it is not to be expected but they will enter in, and it is evident many such have entred in, and experience tells us, that Conscience is not enough to oblige all men to their duty, the best of men had need of all Obligations, &c.* p. 124, 125. I proved the second and the third, from *Experience* not to be denied.

9. The man raves at this in no less than 6 pages : He calls it an *Open notorious shameful Calumny*, and makes me for saying so even the *Vilest of Men*. But what is the matter ? Have we not very many ignorant, sottish, and lazy Men in the Ministry ? If he hath a mind to impose such a belief on the world , let him first try if he can persuade the World that the Sun enlightneth not the World at Noon day ? Did I say

any more? Yes I said *our Church was fill'd with such*, and that signified the main *Body of the Church was such*, when within ten lines I had expounded my self by *many*, but besides (all due reverence first paid to the *Doctors of Proprieties*) I hope it is proper enough to say, A *Garden* is full of *Snails*, though I know there is five times the number of wholesome leaves, or more innocent *Worms* in it, or that a *Beggar* is full of *Lice*, tho they do not cover the fortieth part of his *Body*. I would fain know the difference betwixt *is fill'd*, and *is full*. But it is a *reproach upon our Church*. What do we mean by that? I hope we do not call such men *our Church*. I have owned that *we have very many others*, and why may not those *very many others* be the *main body of the Clergy* as well as the *very many* of these, who can pretend no *Relation* to our or any other Church. but *Titular & Secundum Dicit*. Upon the people it can be no *Reflection*, who generally loath such. Thus we speak *Parables*: But it may be he thinks it is a *Reflection upon the Bishops*, for admitting, or suffering such: If he doth, he is ignorant of our *Law*, and so are any that say it. Let him or them consult any *Law Books* or ask any *Lawyers*, and see if they will tell him That it is in the power of any *English Bishop* to deny *Institution to any*, that can but bring any *Testimony under the hands of three Ministers for their life*, and for their learning, can evidence it by doing as much as a *School-boy*

boy may do at 12 years old (that is turning into Latine 10 or 12 lines of the *Articles* of our Religion) and whether he can deprive any (who hath once read the *Articles*) for any Crimes, but being a *Jew* or a *Schismatick* ? I must confess it is some *Reflection* on our present *Political Constitutions* relating to our Church, which in this point are nothing altered from what they were in the times of *Popery* (notwithstanding the excellency of them we were so often told of.) Nor is it a *Reflection* upon any *Protestant Legislators*; for those who know any thing, know that from *Queen Elizabeth's time*, our *Parliaments* have been about *Bills* against *Pluralists*, and *Non-residents*; and for the *Regulation of the Laws of Ministers*, there have been *Debates* upon *Debates*, and *Bills drawn* and read against *Scandalous Ministers*, but either the *Parliament* hath been turned off to some other momentous business, or not sat long enough to bring the *Bills* to perfection, something or other hath as yet hindred. My Lord Cook observes, No good motion ever died in *Parliament*, which if it be true, and hold so; it may be a ground of hope to us, that we shall have something done at last in cases which concern the *Eternal Salvation* of so many Souls, and people shall not always perish through want of *Vision*, and not any be suffered in a place where their business is by *Life and Doctrine* to shew men the way to *Life and Salvation*, by *Life* or *Doctrine*, or both, to

shew them the way to *Eternal Death* and *Destruction*. Nor will this be ever hindred, but by taking out of the Church *Pluralities* and *Nonresidency* (those two great *Pests* of the Church, so acknowledged and complain'd of in all ages.) By the first I mean Ministers enjoying two or more livings at such distances as they cannot possibly watch over the *Flock* in them, or perform any thing of their duty to them (for *contiguous Pluralities*, where livings are small and people few, and dwelling so near together, that they may meet together in the same place to Worship God, I know nothing to be said against them.) But while our *Constitution* is such, that Ministers may have 2, 3, or more livings at greater distances, they must have Curates to supply them, and it cannot be expected that while they will not allow men half a lively-hood for their pains, they should have generally very *Learned, Diligent, and Sober Men*. The good Lord put this thing into the Hearts of our *Civil Magistrates*.

10. Hence it appeareth that what I said, was no such *Calumny*, as to be a *Reflection* on any one good man, nor upon the *Governours* of our Church, nor yet upon the *Political Magistrate*. What makes our Adversary here in such a rage, as for this twice to call me *Devil*, once by craft, p. 70. another time by *Periphrasis* p. 235. (for we can understand the term Διὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ and that of *The grand Accuser of the Brethren*, tho while he

he thinks not fit, that Ministers in publick Services should use their Gift in Prayer, he can yet think it fit, to express his Charity, by his two gifts, of *Tongues* and *Oratory*.) Yet in thus abusing me, he as much abuseth no mean persons of his own *Brethren*, for he who wrote *The Causes of the contempt of the Clergy*, and those who in their Sermons have complained of the *Debauchery* of the *Clergy* (and they have not been few) have said as much possibly very much more than I have said. I neither said, that the *main body of our Clergy* were such, nor yet that they were *Learned, Diligent, and Sober Men*, I had no reason to say either, because I do not know the tenth part of them, but I know *very many* both of the one, and of the other, and amongst those that I know on either side, those whom I know of the worse sort, are most generally the greatest *Zealots for Liturgies* and greatest *Railers*, against those that are of another mind. I say most generally, and the main body of them are so (Tho there be some learned and sober men, are warm enough too in this case) and for the truth of this I appeal to the knowledge of all our English World.

II. Certainly it had been more worthy of one who hath had the repute which our *Vindicator* hath had, to have owned the thing, which every eye seeth, and declared his sad sense of it, and acknowledge the *defective Constitution* of our Church, ha-

having not had *leisure* and *opportunity* since our *Reformation* from *Popery* to provide against it; and to have told us, That altho the preparation of Ministers work for them had been, or may be a *Temptation* to Men whose hearts are viciously inclined, to indulge their Lusts; yet a *Liturgy* is no necessary cause, of this, nor this a necessary *consequent* of a *Liturgy*. This had been true, modest, and ingenious; by what he hath here said, he hath not *expysed* me, but himself; but if he had so spoke, he had found me agreeing with him, and saying the same thing, p. 124.

12. As to the second Effect which I mentioned, viz. The *loss* of *Ministerial Gifts*. He dare not say, That the *total* *disuse*, or general *disuse* of the *Ministerial Gift* of *Prayer*, is not the next way to lose it. But he tells us, "Blessed be God, in our Church, there's no loss of any Abilities requisite for the due discharge of the Ministry. No loss? If he had said *No want*, I should not have contradicted him. But is there *No loss*? Are there none, or have there been none, who before this tying themselves to *Forms*, could have fitly expressed themselves to God in Prayer, but now cannot without their Book Pray with a Sick Person, or upon any Emergent occasion? I appeal to the *Experience* of the World. And as much as he in his next words, and indeed all along in his Book, contemns, and slighterth an *Ability* fully to express our minds to God in Prayer,

Prayer, I believe there are thousands, and ten thousands of Ministers and Conscientious Christians, that would not want it for all this Worlds good, and perfer it to the knowledge of all *Fathers* and all Languages, and take it to be one of the *Best Gifts* which every one who feareth God is obliged to *Covet*. The Lord lay not to his charge, his scorn and contempt of it. I am afraid, that when he and I shall appear before the *Judgment Seat* of Christ, he will find it a graver thing then a *Childish varying Phrases*. He hath read of words which the *Holy Ghost* teacheth, 1 Cor. 2. 13. Is he sure, that none of the words which a *Godly Minister* or Christian powreth out from the *Conceptions* of his own heart, first inflamed with the sense of his daily renewed *Sins*, and *Wants*, and *Mercies*, are not words which the *Holy Ghost* teacheth? It teacheth expressions in Sermons, 1 Cor. 2. 13. in *Confessions* before men, and therefore our Saviour bids his Disciples take no thought before hand what to say, for it shall be given you in that hour what you shall say, Mar. 13. 11. Luke. 12. 11, 12. and Matth. 10. 20. it is expressly said, For it is not you that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you. May it not be the Spirit of our Father, that speaketh in a good Christian, praying from the conception of his own Heart? Or in a Pious Minister praying for the people of God? Especially considering that that Spirit

rit is the Spirit of Supplications, and Rom. 8. 15. the Spirit of Adoption, by which we cry Abba Father, and v. 26. The Spirit that helpeth our Infirmities, for we know not what to pray for as we ought, but the Spirit it self maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. He can have no Plerophory, that that Text restraineth the Operation of the Spirit there to Impressions upon the Affections. The Spirit may as well speak in us in Prayer, as (which our Saviour asserteth Matth. 10. 20.) it spake in his Disciples in their Confessions, which could be no otherwise, then by prompting them what to say, and so it is expounded, Mark 13. 11. *Whatsoever shall be given you in that hour that speak ye.* They spake, but yet the Spirit did so eminently influence their speech, that Matth. 10. 20. Christ saith, *It is not you that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you.* The case standing thus, I durst not for all this World have said: This was nothing but a School-boys Varying Phrases (which our Answerer hath often told us in his Book) for fear all understanding Christians should have judged me Prophane, and little understanding Communion with God in that duty. What apprehensions, or confidences others may have, authorizing such expressions, I know not; but shall in secret mourn for.

13. I had instanced in a third Fruit or consequent of Liturgies universally imposed, which

which I called a *Flood of Iniquity*. I did mention some drops of that flood. *Bitier words in Pulpits and Sermons, and Printed Books, ungodly representations to Superiors of men, of whom the World was not worthy, suspensions, silencings of many godly Ministers, Ruins of many eminent Ministers of Christ with their Families, separations of Christians one from another, Imprisonments of many to their undoing, Revilings. I might have added Blasphemings of the Holy Spirit of God in his Operations; much of which, if not most, had been prevented if Liturgies of Prayer, had not been imposed or not universally imposed.* Here now our *Vindicator* runs a division of 4 pages; and when he hath said all he can, he must needs say, I have said what is truth. But *this is to charge a great deal of Evil on our Laws and Governours.* And may not a great deal of evil be the fruit of some humane Laws, which when Governours see, it is their duty to repeal such Laws; tho they made them in the simplicity of their Hearts, not foreseeing such effects, and consequents of them? 2. He saith they must be guilty, unless they root out all *Liturgies*: Is there a word by me spoken to that purpose? See the contrary said by me, p. 164. n. 4. *Confusions, Heresies, Blasphemies came in, when Liturgies were shut out* But the question is, Whether if *Forms of Prayer had been admitted, and not Forms of all Sermons*, it had been any proportionable means, to have prevented them?

14. For what he further enlargeth upon p. 239, 240. I shall only tell him, That not one of ten of those who are now against *universally used, or imposed Liturgies of Prayers*, had any concern in the things he mentioned, as things done when *Liturgies* were shut out. For my own part, I appeared not as a man to the World, till the year 1645, so could have no concern in imposing, or perswading the imposing of the *Covenant*, the *Ejection*, *Sequestring*, or *Imprisoning* any for refusal of it. If I remember right, I saw not *London* from 1645 twice, till 1659. I never saw *Olivers* face, never came near an Army. I did very well know all the persons who are said to have wrote the Book called *Smectymnus*, and did know that they were all persons, not short of our *Vindicator for Learning, Piety, Ministerial Abilities*, and all which was good, and much his *Superiors* in age, and that there is no such words or sense of theirs expressed in the 83 and 84 p. of their Answer to the *Remonstrance*, nor any where else that I know. I am not bound to read over all that Answer, because I am not bound to justify every Phrase of theirs.

15. For what our *Vindicator* seemeth to threaten, p. 238. telling me of *Exposing my self to outward Inconveniencies* (by which I suppose he meaneth sufferings.) I must confess such a political consideration might have had, and it may be had too much influence on me 15 or 16 years ago. But
having

Having nothing capable to be impaired, but my *Name and Repute, my Estate, my Liberty, and my Life*; and having experienced, that notwithstanding all my *Candor*, owning the *Lawfulness* of Forms in General, the *Lawfulness* of People joyning in Prayer with those that use them in Devotion, my *self* doing so very often, not condemning any *Ministers* who judge it lawful and more expedient to use them, only forbearing my self to do it, because I judge it sinful for me, and giving my reasons for judging it so; yet because I think it my duty to Preach the Gospel, and have sometimes done it; I have not escaped the rude Tongues of some who are Zealots for it; nor been able to enjoy my *Estate and Liberty*, without a very considerable impairing, by *Imprisonment*, most malicious and vexatious Prosecution, without any colour and pretence of Law; I am much hardened against and prepared to answer such little Topicks; and tho I yet think it my duty to use all lawful means to preserve my self, yet I see reason to suspect, I may have been mistaken, as to the lawfulness of some of my *prudentials*, and to be more confirmed in what our Saviour hath taught us, *Matth. 16. 25. whosoever will save his life, shall lose it, and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall save it.* Yet I trust I shall be always careful, not to suffer as a *Murtherer, or as a Thief, or as an Evil doer, or as a busy body in other mens matters.* *Pet.*

4. 15. but as a Christian, and not be ashamed, but to glorifie God on this behalf.

16. I shall conclude this Chapter with minding my Reader of a fable which Luther makes use of, in his opposition to the Papists, in the beginning of the Reformation. "There was a City (saith he) in which was a Law That none should come into their great Meetings that had any bodily imperfections. If he did, he was to pay a Fine. It happened on a day one came in, in whom those who were set to take care to the Execution of that Law, discerned one imperfection; they demand his Fine, he denies and struggles with them, till they had discerned four Imperfections he had, and then stood upon four Fines. Our Vindicators struggling with me to this degree and in this manner, in this case, putting me upon a more narrow inquiry, into this matter, hath helped me to two or three new Arguments which I before hardly thought of: I will but propound them, let who will improve, or answer them. I think I shall hardly take up a pen again in this cause, having said much more then I judge answered, or capable of a solid answer.

1. To institute any part of Worship, is not lawful for any Superiors.

But to institute words in *Vocal Prayer*, is to institute a *part of Divine Worship*. Ergo.

2. To determine in Acts of Worship, what God hath left at liberty to his Ministers, is unlawful. But

But to determine Ministers, what words Ministers shall use in publick Ministerial Prayer, is to determine to them, and that in an Act of Worship, what God hath left at liberty. — *Ergo.*

3. To submit to the use of any thing in the Worship of God, which God hath not by his precept made necessary; and many in the present age make a *meer Idol*, thinking and declaring by their words and actions, that no other *way of Prayer* is acceptable to God: is sinful. — But, &c.

4. To submit to such a method of Prayer, as must necessarily shut out the immediate Influence of Gods Spirit, as to words in Prayer (which may be, and often is) is sinful and unlawful.

But there may be and often is an influence of Gods Spirit upon Ministers, even as to *Words of Prayer*, and such a thing is (probably) promised; and to tye our selves to *Forms of Words* prescribed by others, manifestly shuts out such an influence, or the use of it. — *Ergo.*

But thus much shall be sufficient to reply to our *Vindicator*, answering my Arguments. Let me now inquire how happily he hath *Vindicated* his own, or other mens, from my *Answers*, Chap 9. of the Reasonable Account.

C H A P. X.

A Reply to the Vindicators 9 Chap. p. 241, &c. The Vindicators Fortification of the 10 Arguments for Forms of Prayer before battered, beaten down, and himself proved to have alledged no reason in his five Reasons, cogent for the general use and imposition of Forms.

1. I took notice of Ten Arguments brought for such Forms of Prayer, and such an use of them, as I had been speaking about.

The first was, *because Forms are not by God forbidden.* p. 135, I told them, They were forbidden, by the Second Commandment, and three sorts of Texts more. He tells us, He hath answered before all I said to justify this. So I have answered now all that he hath said.

2. He Vindicates the Second Argument mentioned by me from my Answer to it, in the same manner. I in like manner say, What he hath said in his *Vindication* to those purposes, I have answered before, in this my *Reply* to his *Vindication*.

3. To their third Argument from the common Topicks of Order and Decency, I answered

answered Order onely respects first and last : he thinks ~~it~~ ^{it} significeth more. It is hard to prove : but be it so ; In Divine Worship, nothing is Order but what God hath prescribed in the Law of Nature or his Word. As to Decency, I had told him nothing was Decent, but that whose contrary is Indecent : for betwixt Decency and Indecency there is no *Medium participationis*. He denieth this, and thinks to prove it, because white and black are contraries ; yet a white Garment may be Decent, and a black Garment not Indecent. But doth he think that it is good arguing from Accidents to Substances, or amongst Accidents from Quantities to Actions ? Surely he should have instanced in some Actions in Gods Worship, which are both Decent and Indecent at the same time. He doth not like I should say, That Forms are no circumstances relating to the Action of Prayer, as it is a meer humane Act, because it might be performed without them ; why ? Because standing or any other gesture, is a Circumstance, and some gesture is alwayes necessary. So words are necessary to all Vocal Prayer, but yet Forms of Words prescribed by others are not so. Though standing or any other gesture be a Circumstance, yet I hope a particular gesture is no necessary Circumstance of Prayer, considered meerly as an humane Act. He tells us again, There can be no publick Prayer without any words, nor unless the words be determined by some. Both these things are true,

but nothing to the purpose ; for our question is about forms of words , prepared by others : and if (as he saith truly) *there can be no Prayer in Publick without words* , then words are a *part of that Worship* (they are the Homage of the Lipps and outward Man) the *External Part* of that Worship , must be words , and no *part of Worship* may be prescribed by man. He saith true , *the words must be determined* by some body. God hath left them to the liberty of his Ministers determination , and what God hath so left at liberty , is the Ministers *liberty* and privilege. I shewed before that Man must not determine in the *Acts or Parts* of Worship , what he hath left at liberty ; for that they may (acceptably to him) do this or that : whether this be *trifling* , let the Reader judge.

4. He hath said nothing to take off my Argument to the fourth Argument , but what I have before taken off , he is again at “ it, *That no pious man can think that the Will and Pleasure of God, is, that mens abilities should be exercised meerly to shew their parts.* All the strength lies in *meerly*, the falshood and vanity of which suggestion , I have sufficiently before shewed.

5. I shall say nothing to what he saith to take off my answer to the Argument , from the 1 Tim. 1. 2. because our *Vindicator* himself will not say it is *conclusive* in the case. I do not think it *probable* , nor the more *probable* , because of the general use
of

of them in the *earliest* ages of Christianity, which I do not believe either proved, or capable of proof.

6. In his p. 247, 248. he comes to take off what I had said to the 7th Objection, *That Superiors may determine us to whatsoever we may determine our selves.* He will acknowledge this not to be *Universally* true. Two cases he excepts. 1. *When the Superiors commands take away the just civil rights and freedoms of the Subjects.* Saith he so? May not the Superior determine me, in a case where I may determine my self, if his determination takes away my Civil Rights? And may he determine me in a case, where my Spiritual Rights and Liberties are concerned, and therein may determine my self? Oh how cheap are Mens Spiritual Rights and Liberties in the eyes of some, and that in matters, where their Souls are so highly concerned in their *standing fast in their liberties*? Are Civil Rights more to be contended for then Spiritual Rights? And may they be contended for against a Civil Superior (tho they be in matters which are his proper Sphere) and may not Spiritual Liberties be contended for, which we derive immediately from God, and of which no Magistrate as to my practice is under God the proximate judge? 2. His other case is, *Where the thing commanded is against the Rules of Conscience,* But surely every man in such things is determined, and hath no power to determine
O 2 himself;

himself; but it is true, these things are no matter of a Law. The Question still is, Who as to my practice shall be the judge, what is against the Rule of Conscience. If he saith my self, he hath determined the case to my sense. Here he speaks something, if the Inferior doth not believe the thing sinful, but if he doth, he hath said nothing at all to the purpose, and that every one may easily discern.

7. It is worth our Readers observation, how ingenuously this *Vindicator* dealeth, he saith that p. 147. I have told them. That the Author of that Argument, would persuade us to be Papists, in that he would have men to think, That the judgment of Superiors is better then our own. My words are these:

It is worth our Readers observation, how the afore-mentioned Author, and he in the pursuit of this Argument, would persuade us to be Papists, acting contrary to the singular judgment of our own Consciences, out of an abounding voluntary Humility and judging (and that as to matters of our particular practice) upon which our Eternity depends, as the miscarriage in them may lay the Soul under the Guilt of Sin. That the judgment of our Superiors is best, whence he would infer, not only a lawfulness, but a necessary incumbent upon a reasonable Soul, which is by its principles obliged to follow that which is best, to obey men that are our Superiors, contrary

trary to our own Opinion and Judgment.

What Faithfulness, or Ingenuity is to be expected from such a Writer? If he hath but so quoted the *Ancients* for Forms of Prayer being generally and universally used, he may have (after his manner) proved what he would, for ought I know. I say it again, That he who perswades me or any other Christian that it his duty in the things of God, contrar to the opinion and judgment of his own Conscience, to obey Superiours, because it is best, doth a thousand times more to promote Popery, then if he should perswade men, to believe Transubstantiation or Purgatory, or any particular Doctrines of Popery; the great Arguments for which are in this Root. And if I could believe, that I ought to do, or believe what the Church or my Superiours believe, because they so believe or do, or command me to do so, tho I veril believe it sinful; I should think it most eligible to be of that Church, which pretends to an Infallible head.

7. And I humbly offer it to the Consideration of those who are, or who are like to be our Legislators, whether it be possible that that Religion can long be kept out; if men may thus teach Blind Obedience (the very mother of it) and (as others have done) confidently assert not only a Real but a Corporeal presence of Christ in the Sacrament; (so ascribing such a body to Christ as is no true body)

down

sent, &c.) yea and Purgatory too, leaving order for Prayers to be made for their Souls departed (as others have done) to instance in no more particulars of very many; and when they have defended themselves, with the most nice, unintelligible distinctions they can, the best of this is but to teach people, *Quam prope, ad peccatum sine peccato licet accedere*, which it is a thousand to one if people (the generality at least) can understand.

8. To take off my Answer to the 10th Argument (for the 8th and 9th he will not own) he refers to what he said before, concerning the necessity of Uniformity, which I denied. I shall also refer my Reader to what I have before said. I do presume my instance from the Decree of Darius, was good enough to prove, that all Superiors Precepts for Uniformity in Worship are not lawful.

9. What he saith p. 253, upon my quotation of Heb. 5. 1. to prove the due notion of a publick Minister in the Worship of God, *He is a person taken from amongst men, and ordained in things pertaining to God, to offer up such services as God had instituted*; which as to the Jews were Gifts and Sacrifices, as to us are Prayer, Praise, Preaching, Administring the Sacraments. He had no mind to understand I designed from thence to conclude, that we having twice ten thousand Christians, that wanted not the Gift of Prayer (blessed be God) our Church

Church could not want sufficient Ministers for that work, seeing she had such Men, and it was her own fault if she did not call them to it.

10. Our *Vindicator* comes in the last place to reinforce his own 5 p. 253. Reasons against the *Batteries* I had given them. His first was,

"That a true, right, and well ordered
"way of Worship in address to God,
"might be best secured to the Church
"in the publick Service of God.

To this I replied, 1. *That is onely a right way of Worship, which God hath instituted.* He saith God hath not instituted the very words *we are to use*, but he hath instituted, That we should *use words in Vocal Prayer*, and left the particular words to his Ministers liberty. Words are an essential part of his Worship, man cannot institute them, nor determine, what of that Nature God hath left to liberty. I mean no other men besides he that Ministreth in Prayer, which appeareth to be a part of his *Institution*, because he hath directed no other way.
2. I had told him that the *security* he talked of was not possible, nor attainable by Forms. He tells me it must be secured as much as may be (that is his sense) but I hope not by depriving Ministers of the just liberty and rights which Christ hath left them, not by making Ministers, the *Ministers of Men*, to read what they have prescribed, instead of the *Ministers of Christ*, doing his work

by the means he hath in Nature and by Scripture directed. 3. I told him that in *Hundreds of Congregations*, for twenty years together, the Worship of God was in England well and orderly performed without *Forms*. There add, and hath been, and is in Scotland, New England, Holland, so as admit what he saith were true in the late times of all the Congregations in England, (which it is very far from) yet there is proof enough, to overthrow his Reason.

11. His second reason was, That needful and comprehensive Petitions, for all Spiritual and outward wants, with fit Thanksgivings, may not in the publick Supplications of the Church be Omitted, when as the tying of all men to the Forms, is the ready way to have them Omitted, as we have had now the experience of two years last past, for a sufficient proof; nor are the ordinary and common wants of Christians, proportionable to the particular renewing wants of States and Churches, Congregations, and Persons.

12. His Third Reason was, That the hearts of Pious Men, might be more devout, and better united in the Service of God, by considering before-hand what Prayers and Thanksgivings, they are to offer up, and come the more ready to joyn and prepared to joyn in them. And when they come, not hear one word about the particular Sins, they have been thinking to confess, but onely sins in general; nor of their present and renewing wants,

wants, nor of their lately received mercies, how great soever they be, nor how Universal soever, for which God certainly expects a particular Recognition and Thanksgiving; but only words of General Thanksgivings; for all Mercies, and general Confessions of all Sins; and General Petitions for all good things.

13. He seems displeased that I should tell him, *Ennoni* may be read *saith*. This he saith is very unlike, but I my self with a hundred more, have heard it more then once; I could name him the particular persons, times and things, but then I should be exclaim'd against again for reflecting, yet it is not yet 14 days since I heard it from one, who (as one would have thought) read the Forms with great Zeal. But then he saith the people may help themselves, having often heard and joyned in the Form; that is, provided they have the most by heart, which not one hath of Ten thousand; and 2. then not without great distraction, for they have great reason to believe, their Leader can Read more perfectly then they can remember.

14. His fourth Reason was, That such difficult parts of Church Offices as Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, the matter of which requires their consideration may in composing a Form be so framed, that men of greatest understanding may with readiest assent, entertain them, and that they might be sufficiently vindicated from the Calumny

Calumny I suppose he means) of the boldest Opposers. My Answer was to that sense, That these were the easiest parts of a Ministers Office, as to External work, for besides the use of his Natural Motions of his hands, he had nothing to do but to repeat the words of our Saviour, which are very short Forms, of Divine Institution, and to apply the general acts of his Office, Prayer and Exhortation to that Work. This now our *Vindicator* denieth not, but he would have security, that men should not Vary. Let him have a Law with all our hearts: But he thinks that according to mens different Notions, they may vary in their Prayers and Exhortations. So they may in their Sermons, before the Sacrament, and what help for that.

12. His last Reason was thus delivered, "That this may be an Evidence to other Churches in future times, after what way we Worship God, and that such a Church is in its measure a pure and incorrupt Church. I answered where hath God required such an Evidence? He tells me, We need not any special command for every good thing. Nor need every good thing be brought into Publick Worship, and made a part of it. I always took the recital of the Creed to be a good thing, but no Part of Worship, and thus himself answers what I next said. That to this end Forms of Sermons are also needful, on this Account. I told him a publick Confession of Faith is a sufficient Testimony.

Testimony. He tells us it is so *as to our Doctrine*, but *not as to our Worship*: Well let there be then a Law made with all our hearts, That none in the publick *Worship* of God, should do any other Act, nor use any other mean, but what God in his Word hath established. We should think this Act as good an Act as ever was made: And this would give a better Evidence to the World then *Forms* can, how we Worship God.

And now I am come to an end of my long journey, where I have not been tyred with the length of my way, but for want of one *Stile* or *Difficulty*, to give my hand or pen the least stop. I am resolved (without great reason) to tread this path no more, I see there is no end of Writing, where Men will take a liberty to repeat what is said, as they please, and run *Vagaries*, nothing concerning the matter in hand, onely studying to divert the *Reader* from understanding the truth, and how to expose those that will venture to contradict their Sentiments. Let those who have a mind to talk at this rate *talk on*, for all me, and please themselves with the noises themselves make, and with having the last word.

F I N I S.

1. The first of these is the fact that the
2. second is the fact that the
3. third is the fact that the
4. fourth is the fact that the
5. fifth is the fact that the
6. sixth is the fact that the
7. seventh is the fact that the
8. eighth is the fact that the
9. ninth is the fact that the
10. tenth is the fact that the

make and with the old word.

ΠΑΡΑΛΕΙΠΟΜΕΝΑ;

A REVIEW
Of the Third Section of the
Third CHAPTER
OF THE
VINDICATION
OF
LITURGIES,

Beginning *Vindicat.* p. 136.

I. **T**Hose who are but meanly
versed in this Controversie,
will easily understand that
our Adversaries three great
Topicks are Unity, Authority, and Antiquity.
Themselves know as well as we, and will
sometimes confess, that to argue from the
Institution of God, and Chri, to the Insti-
tutions of Men is very weak; and the
Pleas from Christs using the same words (as
we translate it;) from the Precepts, for speak-
ing the same thing, And glorifying God with
one Mouth; from the command to Timothy,
That Intercessions, and Prayers, and Suppli-
cations

*cations, should be made for all Men ; from Pauls order for bringing the Parchments from Troas ; are such , as none of them would offer to bring in the Schools , being fit only for a Countrey Auditory. They also know , that not one of their pretended Arguments from Reason , will conclude either necessity or lawfulness, but Unity, Obedience to Superiors , and Antiquity , are the three great Bulwarks from which they think to Batter us who are of another mind. Indeed none of all these , will conclude the general use of such Forms of Prayer as the Question speaks of, either necessary or unlawful , nor can have any force upon an Intelligent Soul till the point of Lawfulness be determined within it self ; for Peace is no further required of us , then as it can be kept , together with our Peace with God ; and who so perswades another by Sin to separate himself from God , that he may keep an Union with Men , hath not learned his Doctrine from the Old or New Testament , which commands us to follow Peace and Holiness (which certainly lies in a first respect to Gods Commands) and no further then as much as in us lyeth , and as far as it is possible to have Peace with all Men , which must certainly be interpreted not concerning our Natural , but Moral Power ; nor are we to obey man , but in Subordination to God : and in my preceding Discourse , I have (I think) made it appear , That no man hath power to appoint an Essential part of Worship
 (which*

(which in *Vocal Prayer*, words must be) nor when God hath prescribed *One Mean* in *Worship*, to direct another; nor yet when God hath commanded us to serve him with the utmost *Attention* and *Fervency*, and consequently to use all means he hath given us in order to that end, can any command of men, limit us to a *Mean*, which we upon experience find, hinders our *Attention* and *Fervency*; nor yet when he hath in any duty promised the influence of his *Holy Spirit*, can Man command any such mode of performance of that duty, as must necessarily shut it out; which must be in the present case, if any influence of the *Holy Spirit* upon our *Words* in *Prayer*, be any part of his promise. And for the *Practice*, and *Examples*, or *Opinions* of good and *Holy Men*; it is impossible they should further lay hold upon our *Consciences* in this matter, then to double our thoughts upon the matter in question, to make us seriously to weigh on what grounds they Act; our selves being as likely to be mistaken as they. This made me pals over our *Vindicators* third Section of his *Third Chapter*, wherein he laboureth to load us, with the prejudice of the *Constant Practice* of the Church against our *Opinion* and *Practice*; something slightly looking upon it but as loss of time and paper, to reply to an *Inconcludent Argument*; and seeing, that the question being about *Sim or Duty*, no *Practice* could conclude on either side.

2. But

2. But yet as the most of Men, so I my self have a great Reverence for things that can be made out to be *Universal Traditions*. Of which nature I hardly know any thing not plainly revealed in Scripture, except the observation of the *Christian Sabbath*, and *Infant Baptism*, neither of which stand upon that single foot; much less do I think, that there is any such thing to be pleaded, for *Ministers Universal performance of their Ministerial Acts in Solemn Prayer*, by the *prescribed Forms of other Men*. Though therefore enough is said, partly in the *Reasonable Account*, partly in the *Supplement*, to answer whatsoever hath been said of this nature, yet having my pen yet in my hand, I shall add a few lines, to justify what is before said, against the *Attques* upon it, and to shew the *weakness* of what is brought a-new in the *Vindication*.

3. Only because we are so apt to vary from the *Question*, I desire the *Reader* would first consider what we do not deny, and therefore needeth no proof. 1. We deny not but from the beginning *Publick Prayers were made by the Minister and Congregation*. 2. We also believe, That very early the use of the *Lords Prayer* was general in the *publick Congregations*; tho we find none enjoined it under *Penalties*. 3. We do believe, That even from the first there were *Orders Set for Churches meeting together for Prayers*, in certain places, and certain times. 4. Nor do we at all doubt but from the beginning,

beginning, many good Men in imitation of *John the Baptist* and of *Christ*, did compose *Forms of Words*, which might instruct the weaker in the due *Method* and *Matter* of *Prayer*; which *forms* also some particular men (not having attained to an Ability fitly to express their minds to God in Publick) might use, or let alone, as they saw reason. But none of these touch the Question, which is, *Whether Ministers who have an Ability fitly to express their mind to God in Prayer, may ordinarily without sin, use the prescribed Forms of other Men?* This our *Vindicator* must prove. In order to the proof of it, he suggesteth, *That they have been used in all Ages in the Church; and it is unreasonable therefore to think them not lawful, or that they any way hinder Devotion.* Now to make this good, every one seeth that (I will not say an Universal, but) a general use of them must be proved. For if some particular men did use such of their own accord, it proveth nothing; we agree they may do so still.

4. I cannot see how this is capable of proof, for it is very unreasonable to imagine a general use without a general Imposition. Can any one think, that all, or most Ministers, for more than 300 years after Christ, should fall into a *Practice, to which neither the light of Nature, nor any Precept in Scripture, or Practice of the Apostles, guided them, without some command from the Governours of the Church?* This command must either be
P from

from all who were *Bishops* over many *Churches*, or from all the *Synods* of particular *Churches*, or from the *Fathers* in some general *Council*, or from the *Magistrate*. It is certain it was not from the *Magistrate*, for there was no *Christian Magistrate* till more then 300 years after *Christ*. It could be from no general *Council*, for there was none till 325 years after *Christ*, when the *Council* of *Nice* Assembled. The next was that Assembled at *Constantinople* 380. The next was at *Ephesus* 431. The fourth at *Chalcedon*, 451. There is no pretence for any such establishment by any general *Council*, till we come to that of *Chalcedon*, nor there, but by *Implication*; and the probability of that I shall examine by and by.

5. Besides the *Councils* mentioned in *Scripture*, there are 17 *Provincial Synods* we read of before the *Council* of *Nice*, 36 more betwixt that and the next general *Council* at *Constantinople*, Anno 380. 17 more, before the *General Council* at *Ephesus*, Anno 431. (12 of which were before that of *Milev*) 8 more before that of the *Council* of *Chalcedon* Anno 451. In all 78 lesser *Synods*, and 3 general *Councils* were before that of *Chalcedon*. Of all these 78, there are but three pretended to have made any *Canon* in the cause. That of *Laodicea* Anno 364, the third *Council* of *Carthage*, and that of *Milev* Anno 402; All *Provincial Councils*, whose *impositions* could reach no further then their own *Provinces*; and I have shewed
and

and shall shew further, That the first decreed no such thing, onely that *Prayers should be in their Churches Mornings and Evenings.* As to that of *Carthage* we have shewed that it is doubtful, whether there were ever such a *Council* or no; if there were, it is certain, it made but 21 *Canons*, this is the 23d. Nor do the words of the pretended *Canon* prove any such thing, but rather the contrary. That of *Milevis* indeed is plain, but it was made upon a particular occasion, and reached no further then *Numidia*; and by their assuming a power to make a *Liturgy* for that *Province*, they have told us that there was none made by *Peter, James, Mark, Andrew, Clement, &c.* nor any then of any general use in the Church, for if there had, they could easilier have directed the keeping to that alone: and it is plain from the words of that *Canon*, that till that time there was a liberty of composition left to the *Ministers of Churches.*

6. I therefore humbly offer it to my ordinary *Readers* observation, how impossible a proof they undertake, who undertake to prove a *General use or imposition of Forms of Prayers* for more then 400 years after *Christ*; being neither able to prove it, from *Universal Practice* of particular Men, nor from more then one of 78 *Provincial Synods* (and that in a particular case of great *Exigence*) nor from any *Canon* of any *General Council*, and I am sure much less from the commands of all particular *Bishops* in their *Diocesses*, or

the 40th part of them : indeed I know not of one. *And I most humbly offer it to our *Superiors*, whether in a time when they are struggling for the very life of our *Religion* against *Popery*, they can shut out *Eminently Learned* and *Pious Men*, because they durst not submit to this *Injunction*, which most certainly can pretend to nothing of *Antiquity*, elder then the Council of *Chalcedon* 451 years after *Christ*, when abundance of *Superstition* and *Popish trash* was crept into the *Rituals* of the Church. Nay I hope to make it good that no such thing had establishment by that *Council*.

7. I have not the *Councils* at large, only 2 or 3 abridgments of them. *Caranza* gives it us in these words :

Can. 1. *A Sanctis Patribus in unaquaq; Synodo, usque nunc prolatis Regulas tenere statuimus ; i. e.* We determine to keep the *Rules* established in every *Synod* until this time. *Iustellus* in his *Code* of the *Universal Church* (whom I think we may trust, and the rather, because our *Vindicator* hath given us such a warrant) hath it in the same words almost, *Ἰς πλεον τῶν ἀγίων πατέρων καὶ ἐκείνων συνόδων ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἡγεμονίας καὶ ἐδιδραμάμεν.* By this the *Canons* of all *Provincial Councils* before that time, were not brought into the *anons* of the *Universal Church* and established by it, but only those mentioned in *Iustellus* his *Code*.

8. The *Code* of the *Universal Churches Canon*, begins with the *Council* of *Nice*,
and

and confirms 79 *Canons* made by them. It goes on with 25 *Canons* of the Synod at *Antioch*, in the year 341; then it confirms 59 *Canons* of the Synod of *Laodicea* made 364, and 7 *Canons* made by the Council at *Constantinople*, made in the year 383, and 8 made in the General Council at *Ephesus*, in the year 431. Then comes the Council of *Chalcedon* in the year 451, which made 29 *Canons*, the first of which was confirmative of those before mentioned, and no more. Then comes the *Novella Constitutio* of *Justinian* made about 531, or 532, that is added to *Justinian* his Code, in these words,

" We ordain that the Holy Ecclesiastical
 " *Canons*, which were propounded
 " and confirmed, by the
 " four Holy Councils, *v. Justinian*
 " viz. that of *Nice* con- *ditum Ecclesiæ*
 " sisting of 308 Holy *Universallip.*
 " Fathers; that of the *128.*
 " Council of *Constanti-*
 " *nople* consisting of 150 Holy Fathers:
 " Those of the first Council of *Ephesus*
 " where *Nestorius* was condemned,
 " and that of *Chalcedon*, where both
 " *Eutiches* and *Nestorius* were con-
 " demned, shall have the Authority
 " of a Law; for we receive the De-
 " crees of the aforesaid Holy Councils,
 " as Holy Scripture, and observe their
 " *Canons as Laws.* This Constitution
 " was made about 541.

19. But we are yet inquiring what Ecclesiastical Sanction Forms of Prayer to be Universally used by Ministers, had by the Council of Chalcedon. I observe first, that the Canons of the Council of Milevis are not in the Code, so not confirmed at all by it. The Canon of the Council of Laodicea indeed is. Let us then hear that Canon as Justellus hath it, *Περὶ τῆς τῆς αὐτῆς λειτουργίας τῶν εὐχῶν παντοῦ καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις καὶ ἐν ταῖς κατωτέραις οὐρανῶν γινώσκου.* That is, We ordain, That the same Liturgy of Prayers, should be made every where both at Nine of the Clock and at Evenings.

Thus much we agree was confirmed by the Council of Chalcedon in the year 451.

10. But what is this to the purpose? It should have been, *τῆς αὐτῆς τύπος τῶν εὐχῶν*, the same Forms of Prayers, that indeed would have been something. Here is nothing but an idle playing with a modern usage of the Term *Liturgy*, which indeed we here in England of late years have appropriated, to Forms of words to be publicly used in Prayer, and it may be the Church of Rome before us; but alas the word signifieth no such thing. In regard the stress of several Arguments from Antiquity lieth upon this poor word, I will once for all disabuse my Reader as to the true sense of it; I will do it from a Great Authority, that of Melancthon and all the Saxon Divines, who agreed in writing their Apology for their Confession tendered to the Emperour Charles the 5th at

Aus-

Ausburgh 1530, which was answered by
 the *Popish Divines Eccius, &c. Eccius* and his
 Associates had catch'd hold of this word,
 and contended that the *Mass was a Sacrifice*,
 because it is by the Ancients called *λεστυρία*,
 a *Liturgy*. *Melancthon* in that *Apology* print-
 ed 1535, in the beginning of the Chapter
De Vocabulis Missæ, thus answereth, "The
 "word *Liturgy*, signifieth only a *Publick*
 "Ministry, and doth fitly sute, what we
 "hold, That one Minister should in the Sa-
 "crament consecrate the Ele-
 "ments, and give the Body The mean-
 "and Blood of Christ to the ing of the
 "people; as one Minister word *Litur-*
 "preacheth, and offereth the gy.
 "Gospel to all the People, ac-
 "cording to that of Paul, *Let a man so judge*
 "of us as *Stewards of the Mysteries of God*; and
 "again *We are Embassadors of Christ*; so the
 "term *Liturgy* excellently agreeth to the
 "Ministry. For the word is an old word
 "used to expresse *publick civil Ministries*.
 "The *Grecians* used it to expresse any pub-
 "lick Taxes, Burdens, or Tributes, the
 "Charges of setting out Navies, &c. as may
 "appear from the Oration of *Demosthenes*
 "*περὶ λειτουργίας*; which Oration is wholly spent
 "about *publick Offices and Immunities* from
 "them, where he saith, That
 "some unworthy men finding In civil
 "themselves priviledged, stu- Authors.
 "died, *ἐκείνοι δὲ τὰς λειτουργίας*,
 "to decline *publick Liturgies*, that is Ser-
 vices,

"vices. So they spake amongst the Ro-
 "mans, as appeareth by the Rescript of the
 "Emperour Pertinax F. de Jure immunitatis.
 "Tho' (saith he) the number of Children doth
 "not free Men πασῶν λειτουργῶν, from all Li-
 "turgies, that is publick Services. And the Com-
 "mentator on Demosthenes saith, Liturgy
 "signifies a kind of Tribute to defray the
 "charges of publick Plays, Navies, Schools,
 "and such things as the publick stock was con-
 "cerned in ——— And (saith he) it is plain
 "from the diphthong ει ι that it is not
 "derived from λητή, which signifieth Prayers
 "(from whence the word Litany is derived)
 "but from ληται which signifieth publick
 "Goods. Thence λειτουργία signifies to take
 "care of publick things, and λειτουργός
 "signifieth such an Officer. Thus far they.

From this account of the civil usage of
 the word, it may easily be in
 In Scripture. Scripture gathered, what it
 signifies in sacred things,
 and proved from Holy Writ. It is used,
 Luk. 1. 23. to signifie all Zacharies publick
 Service in the Temple. We there translate
 it truly Ministration. It is used to expresse
 Pauls publick Service to the Church in suf-
 fering, 2 Phil. 17. Surely that Text is not
 to be translated, If I be offered upon the
 Forms of Prayer of your Faith, but (as we
 do) upon the service of your Faith. So the
 Apostle speaking of Distributions to the poor,
 he calls it the Administration of this Liturgy,
 we translate it Service; so Phil. 2. 30. to
 supply

supply your lack of service to me. Gr. Liturgy; he speaks of *Timoth's* coming to him. Heb. 8. 6. Christ saith the Apostle obtained a more excellent *Liturgy*, we rightly translate it *Ministry*, Heb. 9. 21. all the *Vessells of the Liturgy*, that is of the *Jewish Ministry*; it cannot be of the *Jewish Forms of Prayer*. The *Canon of the Council of Laodicea* (confirmed as being part of the Code by the 1 *Canon of the Council of Chalcedon*) decrees, That the same *Liturgy*, that is publick *Ministry of Prayers*, should be performed at Nine in the Morning, and in the Evenings; which I hope might be without *Forms of words*, of which it speaketh nothing.

II. But he tells us the next *Canon* in *Fustellus* proves they understood *Forms of words in Prayer*. I answer, that is not so: the next *Canon* indeed, directs an Order of the publick *Ministry*, viz. That after the Ministers Sermons they should pray a part with the *Catechumens*, then with the *Penitents*, after this thrice; with the *Believers* once silently, twice speaking out, &c. but in that *Canon* *λεητοργία* is not used, nor any words like it, but *ευχαι* and *προσεχειν*, Prayers and Oblations. But *Zonaras* and *Balsamon* so interpret the *Canon*. I doubt it not; but the one lived 600, the other 700 years after that *Canon* was made, and either of them in ages when *Papery* had prevailed 4 or 500 years, and they knew no other publick Prayers but by *Forms*. I doubt not but

but in that age 100 more would have so interpreted it , to make it justifie their *Practise* ; but what is this to the purpose ? So, many now where they meet with the Terms *Liturgy, Prayers, Offices, Litanies,* presently dream of a proof for *Forms of Prayer*, which none of those words are restrained to. Thus we see there was no establishment of *Forms of Prayer* by the Council of Chalcedon, 451.

12. We must therefore come to *Justinians Novellæ Constitutiones*. I presume every one knows that great *Emperours*, neither use to write out *Folio's*, nor to draw *Prefaces* to them. The Imperial Law in that *Emperors* time (say the *Centuriators and Maxia*) was scattered in near 2000 Books (it was time to abridge it) the *Emperour Justinian* employed in it three *Lawyers*, the principal was one *Tribonianus*, Sleidan saith of him, *He was a covetous profane man, and reported for summs of money given him, fixisse & refixisse leges, to have made and unmade Laws at his pleasure.* He drew the Imperial Law into three Books, called after *Justinians Code*, to which were added, the *Digesta*, and last of all the *Novellæ constitut.* the former contained the *Laws* of ail former *Emperors*; the last such as he himself, and some few *Emperors* next before him made. *Justinian* confirmed these Books, so they became the *Imperial Law*, from the year 542. By the way, tho this *Justinian* did many good things, yet he was an *Here-tick*.

tick, and had many great Vices (It was he who put out the eyes of *Belisarius* that great Commander (by whom he indeed did whatsoever he did worthily in his Wars) &c. so as he was inforced to begg his bread before he died.

13. Out of the *Preface* to these *Novellæ*, our *Vindicator* hath taken something he thinks for his purpose. If he had given us the words of the *Prefacer*, for I cannot find them in *Gothofred*, I could have spoken distinctly to it, but I suppose he hath given all that were for his turn. (Speaking of his *Monks and Clergy*) he saith they would have done otherwise if they had acquainted themselves τὰς θείας λειτουργίας ἐκμαθάνον; that is to learn the way of the Holy Ministrations; as to what he saith, cap. 2, and cap. 6, having not the Book, I can say nothing unless he had given us the *Greek words*. I suspect them to be but λειτουργίας or εὐχαῖς, which prove nothing. But it is not worth the while, for admit these proofs prove the thing, it proveth no *Sanction of Forms of Prayer* before 542: So I lose but 59 years. Nor do I understand what need *Pope Adrian* had 259 years after this, to get a *Civil Sanction* from *Charles the Great*; if one were 259 year old made by *Justinian*, and made a part of the *Imperial Law*.

14. But I cannot but observe by the way how our *Author* fetching his *Ecclesiastical Sanction* but from the *Council of Chalcedon* 451, and *Justinians Novelle* 541, hath quite

but in that age 100 more would have so interpreted it, to make it justify their Practice; but what is this to the purpose? So, many now where they meet with the Terms *Liturgy, Prayers, Offices, Litanies*, presently dream of a proof for *Forms of Prayer*, which none of those words are restrained to. Thus we see there was no establishment of *Forms of Prayer* by the Council of Chalcedon, 451.

12. We must therefore come to *Justinians Novellæ Constitutiones*. I presume every one knows that great Emperours, neither use to write out *Folio's*, nor to draw *Prefaces* to them. The Imperial Law in that Emperours time (say the *Centuriators and Maxia*) was scattered in near 2000 Books (it was time to abridge it) the Emperour *Justinian* employed in it three Lawyers, the principal was one *Tribonianus*, Sleidan saith of him, *He was a covetous profane man, and reported for summs of money given him, fixisse & refixisse leges, to have made and unmade Laws at his pleasure.* He drew the Imperial Law into three Books, called after *Justinians Code*, to which were added, the *Digesta*, and last of all the *Novellæ constitut.* the former contained the *Laws* of all former Emperours; the last such as he himself, and some few Emperours next before him made. *Justinian* confirmed these Books, so they became the Imperial Law, from the year 529. By the way, tho this *Justinian* did many good things, yet he was an Here-
tick,

rick, and had many great Vices (It was he who put out the eyes of *Belisarius* that great Commander (by whom he indeed did whatsoever he did worthily in his Wars) &c. so as he was inforced to begg his bread before he died.

13. Out of the *Preface* to these *Novellæ*, our *Vindicator* hath taken something he thinks for his purpose. If he had given us the words of the *Prefacer*, for I cannot find them in *Gothofred*, I could have spoken distinctly to it, but I suppose he hath given all that were for his turn. (Speaking of his *Monks and Clergy*) he saith they would have done otherwise if they had acquainted themselves τὰς θείας λειτουργίας ἐμπροβαίον; that is to learn the way of the Holy Ministrations; as to what he saith, cap. 2, and cap. 6, having not the Book, I can say nothing unless he had given us the *Greek words*. I suspect them to be but λειτουργία or εὐχὰς, which prove nothing. But it is not worth the while, for admit these proofs prove the thing, it proveth no *Sanction of Forms of Prayer* before 542: So I lose but 59 years. Nor do I understand what need *Pope Adrian* had 259 years after this, to get a *Civil Sanction* from *Charles the Great*; if one were 259 year old made by *Justinian*, and made a part of the *Imperial Law*.

14. But I cannot but observe by the way how our *Author* fetching his *Ecclesiastical Sanction* but from the *Council of Chalcedon* 451, and *Justinians Novellæ* 541, hath quite

quite destroyed his instance out of *Eusebius de Vita Constantini*, c. 17, 19, 20, ἐνχαὶ εἰδικότες for if the English of that be *Prayers by Authority appointed*, we must find an higher *Authority* constituting their use, then that of *Justinian*, who did what he did 542; and *Constantine* had been dead 200 years before. Nor was the *Council of Chalcedon* of 130 years after *Constantines* death, so that it should seem only the *Prayers* were constituted of which he speaks cap. 17; not the *Forms* also; but I shall meet with that anon: besides this *Civil Sanction* of *Justinian* being in his *Novellæ* (which contained only his own *Laws* and some *Emperors* that went immediately before him) it is a certain proof there was no *Ancienter Civil Sanction* by *Constantine* and *Theodosius*, &c. we should then have found it in *Justinians Code*, not in his *Novellæ*; for any *Ecclesiastical Sanction* there is no pretence to any until the *Council of Chalcedon*, and I have shewed there is no proof to be fetched from thence: besides the *Canon* of the *Council of Milevi* being not brought into the *Code* of the *Universal Church*, is a sufficient Argument, there was no such thing confirmed by the *Council of Chalcedon*; for that *Canon* is the only plain *Canon* in the case.

15. But (*Dato non concessō* as we say) admit, That from the year 541, they had been so imposed by *Justinian*, and made a part of the *Imperial Law*, what then? I had been mistaken 59 years (which I am far from

from believing or seeing the least ground for.) Will any one say that the practice of a *Romane Emperor* in that age, or indeed the *Church* under his *Government*, was a *Copy* for any *Protestant Church* in all things to write after? I refer my Reader to the sad account given by the *Centuriators* (who were all *Learned Protestants*) of the most corrupt state of the *Church* in this Age; see *Magdeburg. Centur: Centur. 6. ap. 137, impr. Basil.* I think any one who is a *Protestant*, will be of another mind. The *Pope* indeed at that time was not well set in his *Saddle*, it was 6 or 7 years after that age, before he got the Title of *Universal Bishop*, but his foot at this time was in the *Stirrop*, and the *Bridle* in his hand.

16. But our *Vindicator* will go higher with us; he will prove them from the year 400 to the year 500. I hope he means generally used in publick Devotion or imposed for such use, or he proveth just nothing. To prove this, he again brings in the *Canon of the Council of Chalcedon*: I have already said enough to that. Next he brings in *Proclus Bishop of Constantinople*, and he finds his Writings in *Bibliotheca Patrum*; he tells us he declares *Forms of Divine Service*, (what is the Greek word?) To have been delivered from *St. James*, and *St. Clement*, and to have been ordered by *St. Basil*, and *St. Chrysostome*. That there was one *Proclus Bishop of Constantinople* soon after *Chrysostome*, *Eusebius* tells us: But that he left

us any Writings must be proved from better Authority then that of *Bibliotheca Patrum*. However, he saith as much for St. James and Clements Forms of Prayer, as he doth for *Basil* or *Chrysostomes*, and as to them our Author declares his not giving credit to him, nor is it reasonable he should; for it is not probable, that had there been any *Apostolical Liturgies*, *Chrysostome* and *Basil* would have made any. Nor was *Proclus* a likely man to impose any; for *Eusebius* l. 7. c. 4. gives us this Character of him:

“He vexed no Sect, but preserved and re-
 “stored to the Church the great Jewel of
 “Meekness, which is best for the Church;
 “wherein he imitated the Emperor Theodo-
 “sius: for as he would not exert his Imperial
 “Power, against any accused for Religion, so
 “neither did *Proclus* concern himself, as to
 “those who held a diverse Doctrine.

17. Our *Vindicator* riseth higher, and will prove something from the year 300 to the year 400; but I observe he never tells us what: will he prove the *Lords Prayer* was used? Or that some Forms were made by others? Or that some men used some Forms? None denieth all this. But that which he is to prove, is, That such Forms were generally used by, or imposed upon all Ministers in any considerable part of the Church. “All
 “his proof is from the *Liturgies* of *Chry-*
 “*ostome* and *Basil*. *Julians* speaking of *me*,
 “an Order amongst Christians in Worship,
 “which

“ which *Sozomen* calleth *εὐχαὶ πρυμναί* ,
 “ and *Nazianzene* Orat. 3.p. 101, 102, calls
 “ them *εὐχαὶ πύων ἐν μύσταις*; considering what
 “ himself had quoted out of *Eusebius* ,
 “ and from the Council of *Laodicea*, n. 5,
 “ 6, 7, 8.

18. What he hath said out of the Council
 of *Laodicea*, hath had its full answer; what
 he hath said from *Eusebius* hath had an An-
 swer in part, and anon shall have a fuller re-
 ply to it: at present I will onely concern my
 self in the other. For the *Liturgies* of *Basil*
 and *Chrysostome*, admit they did make any ,
 I would fain know what line of proof we
 have, that made they were not left at liber-
 ty; we have before proved there could at
 this time be no *imposition* of them, doth any
 think there were not many in their *Diocesses*
 that needed Forms of Prayer both for their
 Instruction, and to help them in their *De-
 votion*? How doth it appear that *Chrysostome*
 or *Basil* did themselves use any? 2. This
 cuts the Throat of all the fictitious *Aposto-
 lical Liturgies*. Had there been any such
 things found out in their times, there is
 no doubt but they would have rather re-
 commended them then any of their own un-
 to their people. 3. Both these great Men
 flourishing in the time of the *Milevitane*
Council, it is not likely had there been
 known *Liturgies* by so famous Men as *Bas-
 il* and *Chrysostome*, that they would not
 without any more ado, have ordered the
 reading of them, they especially living at
 that

that time or a little before. But 4thly, As I have before said, what imaginable proof can there be more then we have, that those *Liturgies* were none of theirs. The *Copies do not agree*, there are *Doctrines* in them quite contrary to their *Doctrines*, *hymns* not used in their times, *words* not then in use, *Prayers for Persons* living 500, 700 years after their time. But there is enough said by my *Lord of Morney* in the case, by *Learned Rivet* in his *Critici Sacri Specimen*, in the *Reasonable Account*, p. 67. Supplement P. 43, 44.

19 As to our *Vindicators* Quotation out of *Sozomen*, concerning *Julians* design to bring the *Pagan Religion* in credit, the Reader must be wary, for 1st. *Sozomen* tells us the summ of what *Julian* did in his own words, then for the proof of it he referreth to *Julians* own letter to the *Pontefsee* of *Galatia*, which he giveth us at large. The words our *Vindicator* quotes (as they are in *Sozomen*) for he doth not love to give us his quotations full are these. (*Soz. l. 5. c. 15.*)

“ He (saith he, that is *Julian*) determined
 “ to adorn the Gentiles Temples, both with
 “ utensils and furniture (*Apparatu* saith the
 “ Latin Translator) and the order (*τάξις*) of
 “ the *Christian Religion*; and besides with
 “ Seats and Pews for the Teachers and Le-
 “ cturers of the *Pagan Doctrine*, and Exhorta-
 “ tions, and with Prayers prescribed for cer-
 “ tain days, and hours, and Monasteries. —
 Then he referreth for the proof to *Julians*
 own

own Letter. where is not a word of Prayers. ——— What is there in this, to prove the Christians had at that time Forms of Prayer in the Church. Because they had ~~not~~ *an Order in Worship*. and because ~~the~~ *had some set days for Prayer*, they ordered Prayers on certain days, and hours, must they needs be *Forms*? Nor do I believe was the *Common Prayer Book of Julian* made for the Heathen, ever yet seen by any learned man, at least, I never heard of it. But what our *Vindicator* means by his next words [which *Nazianzene* calls *εὐχὴν ἡρώδης μίστε*, which (with all submission to his skill in Critical Learning) I think is better translated *partly a Form of Prayers*, then as he doth *Forms of Prayers in parts*] I cannot Divine. Doth he mean that *Naz.* expounded *Sozomen's εὐχὰς παραμύσεις* That could not be, without a Resurrection, for *Nazianzen* died 389, which was above 50 years before *Sozomen* wrote, (was not this as great a miracle as *Gregorius Magnus*, his living 200 years?) What then? Did *Nazianzen* expound *Lucian's* words? There is no Evidence he ever spake any such, only *Sozomen* so phraseth what he did, but *Lucian* in his Epistle saith no such things, or at least hath no such words. Indeed *εὐχὴν ἡρώδης* is more properly expressive of the thing in Question, *Forms of Prayer*, then *εὐχὰς* or *λεσιουργίας*. But *Nazianz.* is not by our *Author* quoted to have said any such thing was established, only to expound the words

of another *Author* who wrote 50 years after he was dead, or *Julians* who never appears to have used such words. So he is a fine flourish of words to no purpose, but to delude the Reader.

20. Our *Vindicator* is now come to his proof from the year 200 to the year 300, where he refers to his proof in *Libertas Eccles.* from what he had of *Origen* and *Cyprian*, and I refer to my answer, in my *Supplement*, p. 21. 22, only minding our *Vindicator* that there is a great deal of difference betwixt *ευχαριστιας προσευχη* and *προσευχας ευχαριστιαις*: Prayers appointed, and Forms of Prayers appointed. The latter is not in *Origen*, but the former, which proves no appointment of Forms; but that there should be Prayers at such times.

21. "For what he addeth out of *Tertullian*, of their having a *Form of Renuntiatio* in *Baptism*, and *Hymns*, and the Council of *Antioch* censuring *Paulus Samosetanus*, for refusing the *Hymns*: It had been proper to have told us the *Nicene Council* also established a *Form of Confession of Faith*. Are we arguing about *Hymns*, *Forms of Confession of Faith*, and *Abrenunciation of Idolatry*, or about *Forms of Prayer* to be used in *Devotion*? Were the other *Acts of Worship*, as *Prayer* is (I mean the two first, for singing indeed was) from the instance of the *Ennych* and *Philip*, *Acts* 8. it seems to be an appendant to the Ordinance of *Baptism*, that grown persons offering themselves

selves to *Baptism*, should profess their Faith in *Christ*, which could not be without a *Renunciation of Idolatry*. But surely those were no Acts of *Adoration or Devotion*: So as these instances are meer *Transitions*, from things of one kind to things of another; from whence no proper conclusions can be.

22. The Argument from *Singing by Forms* is as improper, for a *Form* is necessary there, how else can a whole Congregation sing the same thing? But it is not necessary in publick Prayer, by any necessity of Nature or Divine Precept. Now it is wide Arguing, to conclude from the use of *Forms* in an Act of *Worship* which cannot be performed without *Forms*; to the lawfulness of them in another Act of *Worship*, which may be performed without them.

23. I must confess, I never was for *Singing any Hymns or Psalms or Spiritual Songs in Publick Worship*, but what were *Scriptural*. My reasons are, 1. Because I take singing to have a cognation with *Reading*, only with a *Tuneable Voice*, now I know nothing but the *Holy Scriptures*, which can be read as an Act of *Homage* to God. 2. Because it is needless, we have *Scriptural Hymns, Psalms, and Spiritual songs* enough. 3. Because I know none specially commissioned to compose them, and *Psalms* is no ordinary gift. 4. Because it hath proved and may prove of very dangerous consequence, and I am much mistaken if I have not read

some *Ancient Canon* prohibiting it, tho I know it hath been since admitted in some Churches by *Canons*.

24. For the first 200 years after Christ, he speaketh faintly, saying only that *Iustine Martyr* and *Ignatius* have two expressions which seem to favour it. He only further mentions *Hymns*, and proveth the use of *Hymns* of *Ecclesiastical composition* from *Pliny* and *Lucian*, no very competent Witnesses of the *Christian Churches* affairs. The early use of the *Lords Prayer* is easily yielded him, but it is a strange proof of a *Form of Prayers* composed by other Men, and generally used, or imposed, to prove (as p. 158) That they began in some Churches with the *Lords Prayer*, and ended with the *Hymns* of many names, which Mr. Gregory thought was the clause at the end of the *Lords Prayer*, and he doth but guess it some other. The *Lords Prayer* cometh not within our question, be it a *Form* or not a *Form*.

25. Whatsoever he saith a p. 160. ad p. 164. is rather *ad pompam* than *ad pugnam*, it all referreth to the use of *Forms of Prayers* in the *Jewish Church*. To it all, I shall only add 2 things.

1. It is very improbable, and will appear so to every considerate Christian, that we should have in Scripture a full account of the *Jewish Church* from its Cradle to its Tomb, and so particular an Account of the way of *Worship* which God established amongst them, from which they might not vary;

vary; and they should have *Forms of Prayers established* for ordinary use, and the Scripture not mention any thing of them: we read in Scripture of other *Books* they had, some of which are perished, some preserved for our *Instruction*, and *Guidance*. We read of the *Book of the Law* many times, but never of their *Common Prayer Book*, nor of any person that used the 18 *Prayers*. We read *Nehemiah 8*. That in a solemn day of *Worship*, the whole *Congregation* met, and called to *Ezra* for the *Book of the Law*, he brings it, they read in it *from the Morning to Mid-day*, v. 1, 2. After this we read of many *Priests* and *Levites* who read in the *Book of the Law*, distinctly, and gave the *People* the sense of it, and made them to understand the reading thereof; but we read not a word of their *Book of Prayers*, either there, or in any other part of Scripture: We read in *Luke* that when our Saviour came into the *Synagogue* on the *Sabbath day*, they brought him the *Book of the Prophet Isaiah*, he read in it and preached out of it, but neither there do we read of the *Book of 18 Prayers* brought forth. I must confess that in ordinary cases it is not a good Argument, That this, or that thing was not in being or in use, because there is no *Sacred Record* of the being or use of it: But certainly concerning *Gods Worship* amongst the *Jews*, it is a good Argument, to prove there was no such thing established in their *Worship*, because in the *Holy Scriptures*,

1000, where we have the full story of that Church, a full account of their *Worship*, either by *Moses*, or *David*, so many charges to them not to add thereto, nor to diminish there-from, there is not any mention of a *Book of publick Prayers*, which God directed for that Church: we read only of a *blessing* which looketh like a *Form* (tho some have been of another mind) of Gods own directing, tho we often read of the *Book of the Law*, called for, brought, read in, and often read of the *Servants of God* Praying publicly, yet not the least mention is made of a *Book*, or *Forms* by which they prayed. Admit they had had *Forms*, if God had prescribed them, it had been out of our question, who will freely allow God to prescribe his own *Homage* and *Worship*; but to think that any of the *Jews*, or the whole *Sanhedrim*, had Authority to make any for universal use, when God gave such punctual directions both to *Moses* for the *Service* of the *Tabernacle*, and all things therein, and to *David* for the *Service* of the *Temple*, that it is expressly said *Exod.* 39. 42. 3. That the very structure of the *Tabernacle* was according to all that the *Lord* commanded *Moses*, and *Deut.* 4. 2. there is so express a command: *You shall not add to the word, which I command you, nor shall you diminish from it*; which is repeated, *Deut.* 12. 32. and *David* saith, *1 Chron.* 28. 11. 12. 13. 19. *All this the Lord made me to understand in Writing by his hand upon me,*

v. 12. the pattern of all that he had by the Spirit. When we read of Nadab and Abihu, being struck dead, *Levit. 10.* for but using ordinary fire in a Sacrifice, and of Uzzab being struck dead for but touching the Ark when it shook in the New Cart, it being Gods prescript that that Family of the Levites, should carry the Ark on their shoulders, *Num. 4. 15, 7, 9.* I say after all this, for any to go about to prove that the Jews in their Worship had Forms of Prayer not prescribed of God, which their Ministers were bound to use, and of which is no mention in Scripture, is an undertaking fit for none but those who think they can prove *Quidlibet e quolibet*; nor to be believed by any, but such as are very credulous. Our Vindicator saith their very Sacrifices were Rites of Supplications, and as to them they were limited, and used no such Variety. Rites of Supplication, and Supplications are two things, and these Rites were limited by God, nor by the Sanhedrim, I hope, nor were they without some variety in them. For his instance 2 *Chron. 29. 30.* It is said, They praised God with the Words of David, and Asaph the Seer. Asaph was a Prophet, David told us, he ordered nothing but by the Spirit of God, what he understood by the hand of the Lord in writing upon him. For *Joel 2. 17.* which he quoteth, surely Joel was divinely inspired, nor is that Prayer surely of length enough for a whole Office, nor was it more then a general direction for

matter to be enlarged in words, as the Jewish Minister thought fit. For what Dr. Lightfoot, Dr. Ontram, Scaliger, Buxtorf, Ainsworth, tell us, they have had their Intelligence from the Rabbies, the eldest of which (of whom we have any Record) was (saith *Alstedius*) after the world was 3380 years old. The *Hierusalem Talmud* was finished by R. *Jochanan* 250 years after Christ, the *Babylonian Talmud* not till 500. The most of the Writings of their Rabbins, saith *Alsted*, appeared not to the World till 1000 years after Christ. Now how competent Witnesses these are (whose Books also are as full of Fables as leaves) of the practice of the Jewish Church before Christ, or in its *incorrupt* state; let any judge who are men of sense.

2. But admit it were a thing capable of proof, that the Jews in their incorrupt times, and that by Gods command, ordinarily used *Forms of Prayer* in their *Worship*, and that such as were neither prescribed by God nor any Prophet, or Penman of Holy Writ, or that in and about, and since Christs time, they have used such *Forms of Prayer* ought this to guide the Practice of the Christian Church? Or will it prove that the same thing is lawful in the Christian Church? I judge not: For the Jews had by Gods prescription a *Worldly Sanctuary*, and as some Typical so many Carnal Ordinances (as the Apostle speaks) which are to continue but till the time of Reformation. Mu-
lick;

sick, which was one of the things directed by David, by the Spirit of God upon him, to be used by the *Jewish Church*, was no *Typical Ordinance*, but it was a *Carnal Ordinance*, upon which the primitive Church disused it, retaining *singing only* as *Justin Martyr* tells us *Quæst & Resp.* 107. where he calleth it a Service *τοῦ ἱεροῦ* for Children (with allusion to the *Apostle*, who compareth the state of that Church, to the state of Children under age) therefore the Gospel Church threw it out; but he tells us that *τὸ αἶμα ἀπλῶς* plain singing was not so; and it was therefore retained: besides it was justified by our Saviour, commanded by the *Apostle*, &c. In that very Chap. *Joel* 2. where at the 17. v. Our *Vindicator* thinks he hath found a *Collect* to be used in the *Jewish Worship*, he might have also found a Promise at v. 28. relating to the days of *Pentecost*, (as appears by *Acts* 2. 17. I will power out my Spirit on all flesh, and this Spirit *Zech.* 12. 10. is a Spirit of Supplication, a Spirit of Adoption, teaching us to cry *Abba Father*; and because we know not what to pray for, helping our Infirmities with strong cries and groans which cannot be uttered, *Rom.* 8. It is therefore very ill arguing, to argue Divine Institutions under the Gospel, and the modes or means of them, from the Institutions under the Law. But far worse, to argue not from the Institutions of God, but the Traditions and Practices of Men in the *Jewish Church*. Are we then
igno-

ignorant how severely Christ taxed the Traditions of that Church in his time? Telling them they had by them made the Law of God of no effect. For which tho our Saviour did not wholly desert their Church, but was often with them, heartily joyning with them in his *Fathers Institutions*, yet he doubtless never approved nor joyned with them, in such Traditions as he had so declared against.

26. Our *Vindicator* in the close of this Section hath a passage out of *Melancthon*, from whence he would make us believe, that *Melancthon* judged that *Forms of Prayer* were always used and commanded in the Church: I shall the more diligently examine this, to learn my Reader not over much to trust the *Vindicator*, without looking himself into the *Authors* he citeth, and because it hath had so contrary an influence on me: That whereas before I was something doubtful, whether the *Saxon Churches* (since the *Reformation*) had not an universally imposed Liturgy, knowing that *Luther* did at the beginning reform a *Missal* for them, upon reading the common place of *Melancthon* from whence our *Vindicator* takes his quotation; I begin to be of another mind, and to think that even those Churches (tho of all other most imperfectly Reformed) had no other then a *Book of Prayers* composed, and left at liberty. The place he quoteth is in *Melancthons common place, De Precatione*. The words of our *Vindicator* are these:

“ And

" And upon a view of what I have now
 " produced in this Section, the Reader
 " may see reason to be-
 " lieve the truth of what *In loc. Theol.*
 " was asserted by Me- *de Presat.*
 " Melancthon concerning
 " Forms of Prayer. *Ecclesia semper eas*
 " *proposuit, & publice & private in eas*
 " *exerceri jubet.* The Church of God
 " hath always proposed them, and
 " thought them fit to be used both publick-
 " ly and privately.

27. Melancthon was a great Light, and
 one of the first threes in the Reformation
 of Germany from Popery, of the perswas-
 ion of Luther and the Saxon Divines, who
 differed much, both from the *Suitzerland*
Churches, and the five *Imperial Cities*, and
 many others, both as to the indifferency of
Rites and Ceremonies, which had been used
 in Popery, and in the great point of the
True Corporeal presence of Christ in the Lords
Supper. This is manifest in the whole Hi-
 story of those times, wrote by *Sculterus*,
Hospinian, and *Sleidan*. He published two
 Editions of short *Com. Places*, the one 1535,
 which he dedicated to *Hen. VIII. King of*
England, the other largely printed 1543.
 In both which is a common place about
 Prayer, but in the first no such passage as
 our *Vindicator* quoteth. In the latter I find
 something like it, p. 558. In these
 words.

" *Sed quia difficilis est Attentione, in reci-*
tionis

" citatione ideo ignavi fugiunt recitati-
 " ones: At Ecclesia semper eas proposuit,
 " et publice et privatim eas exercere jubet;
 " Ideo Psalmi traditi sunt, summo concilio
 " compositi & Christus ipse formam pre-
 " candi proponit, ac nominatim inquit;
 " Luc. 11. Cum Oratis Dicite: verba,
 " et Recitationem certam prescribit ut an-
 " tea præscripserat Johannes. Tenea-
 " mus Ergo et recitemus formam Divi-
 " no consilio traditam. In Eng-
 " lish:

But because in recitation attention is
 difficult, therefore lazy persons decline
 Recitations, but the Church always pro-
 posed them and commanded them to be
 used both in publick and private. The
 Psalms were therefore composed with the
 greatest wisdom, and Christ himself pro-
 poseth a Form of Prayer, and particular-
 ly saith; Lu. 11. When you pray say. He both
 prescribeth words, and a certain Recital,
 as before John had done. Let us hold, and
 recite that Form which our Lord hath gi-
 ven us. — Then he largely expounds the
 Lords Prayer.

28. It is manifest that Melancthon here
 speaketh not one word of such Forms of
 Prayer as are within our question, which
 are Forms composed, and prescribed by other
 Men not divinely inspired, or commissioned
 by God, to order things in his Worship. He
 neither here, nor (that I can find) in any
 part of this common place, mentions any
 but

but the *Lords Prayer*, the *Psalms of David*, or some other *parts of Holy Writ*, the use of which we most freely allow even to the best of *Ministers*, tho it may be we have no such opinion of the *necessity of the use of the same words and syllables*, as some others have had, or have.

29. Neither doth he by *Recitations* (which he saith the Church always commanded) mean *Forms of Prayer* (as our Author suggesteth) it is a most unaccountable thing why *lazy persons* should (as he saith) *decline Forms*. But the thing he is speaking of is *Vocal Prayer*, in opposition to the *Papish Practices of Priests in Publick Worship*, *Muttering Prayers in secreto*, making the people believe that whether they heard what was said or no, joyned in one Perition or no, yet they were the *Prayers of the Church*, and upon that account heard for them. This is it he opposeth, and saith the contrary was always ordered and commanded by the Church. That *Christ* ordered it otherwise, he bids them in *Praying say*, not *mutter to themselves only*; and that the *Psalms* were made to be sang out, not mumbled over *in secreto*; and this is all can be made of that *Paragraph*.

30. From the whole method and structure, and matter of that *common place* it appears plainly that *Melancthon* did think *All Ministers might not perform ordinarily their Ministerial and Family Acts of Prayer*,
by

by the prescribed Forms of other Men, for his whole business is to instruct Students for the Ministry in the true nature of Prayer, the parts and methods of it, the understanding of the Lords Prayers, &c. He first determines, Supplications and Thanksgivings the two great parts or species of Prayer; then p. 532, 533, he goes on, shewing the difference betwixt the Prayers of Christians, and those of Pagans, Jews, and Mahumetans, directing the first to distinguish themselves, by praying in the Name and Mediation of Jesus Christ. After this he casts his discourse under 5 heads, of all which he discourseth severally. 1. In order to a due Compellation of God he adviseth a Premeditation, what God is, who Christ was, what he hath done, &c. 2. He adviseth a Meditation concerning the Precepts enjoining Prayer, several of which he mentioneth. 3. He adviseth the consideration of the Promises, for this life, and that which is to come, and instanceth in many, p. 536, 537. 4. He sheweth the necessity of the exercise of Faith in Prayer, and directeth the different exercise of it in Petitions for Temporal and Spiritual, and Eternal good things, 538, 539, 540, 541. Then he comes and directs men what to pray for others, and how. 5. He directs that the matter of Prayer, *Cogitetur ac Ricitetur*, should not only be *Endited* in and by the Heart, but *Recited* by the Lipps. He again repeateth the Matter, and Order, and Method, and justifieth the lawfulness of begging

begging Temporal good things, and giveth
 reasons for it. answering the Arguments of
 some against Praying for Temporal good things,
 to p. 555. and 556. He tells us there
 may be Prayer Gemitu by a sigh; but it
 is profitable both for the Younger and Elder
 to keep a well ordered Form in Compellation of
 the true God, that they may distinguish true
 Christian Prayers from those of Jews, Turks,
 and Pagans, minding us of the Divine Pro-
 mises, and comprehending the certain matter
 of Prayer. Such he saith were Jacobs Pray-
 ers, and many others Recorded in the
 Prophets: p. 557, he saith let us therefore
 accustom our selves to Recital, and we may
 use well composed Forms without Supersti-
 tion or Magick (that is provided those
 Forms have no Superstition in them, nor are
 thought to have a Magical Vertue or Ope-
 ration from the meer sound of such and such
 words rather than other, for which no
 reason can be given.) Let us not (saith he)
 recite the Hymns of Homer, Orpheus, or
 Callimachus, but let our Souls move to-
 wards God, with a confidence in Christ
 revealed. He adds in the same page many
 Lazy, Drunken, Careless persons condemn Re-
 citallin Prayer, but (saith he) let good Men
 be perswaded to accustom themselves to o-
 thers, for which he giveth Reasons; after
 which come in the words at first cited. I
 can understand nothing by this, but that
 many Lazy, Drunken, Careless Papists,
 both Priests and others, despised Vocal
 Pray-

Praying, some of them pretending they prayed in heart, others perswading the people that if the *Priests muttered over the Church Prayers*, tho the People heard not a *Petition*, nor understood none of them, yet it was well enough, the *Church Prayers* were said, and they were of avail enough for them.

Melancthon doth indeed say (but it is three sides before in my book) That a well ordered Form may be useful both for young and old, provided men did not use it *Superstitiously* (which they must do who judge it *Universally necessary*) nor have any *Magical Conceit* of it, as if the very words in it were acceptable to God, tho no reason could be given why those words more then others, expressing the same matter should be so. But his immediate opposing that to that Prayer, which he saith may be by a *meer sigh*, and opposing *Cogitetur* and *Recitetur*, makes it apparent that he meaneth no more then a *Vocal Prayer* opposed to what is merely *Mental*, and as may be seen by what there followeth, he chiefly referreth in that place to a Form of *Compellation of God*, whether *Scriptural*, or according to the sense of *Scripture*. This was to bring off such as were newly converted from *Popery*, from *Prayers to the Virgin Mary* and other *Saints*. Yet *Melancthon* afterward doth indeed direct the use of the *Lords Prayer*; (which he largely openeth) but saith nothing of any *Forms* but those upon a *Scriptural Record*,

cord, and commendation; not a word of *St. Peter's*, *St. James's*, *St. Marks*, *St. Andrews*, *St. Clements*, *St. Ambrose*, *St. Basils*, or *St. Chrysostomes* or *Gregory's Liturgies*. Yet indeed in that State of the Church the Proposal of some Forms of Prayer composed by men was necessary in Publick Service, tho not for all Ministers; they were newly come, and still coming off from Popery, where in their Publick Worship they had no other Prayers, nor any liberty for others, and the generality of their Priests were very unfit for any thing but Reading a Prayer. In this case what is necessary is lawful, tho not the full duty of Ministers in Prayer, nor to be rested in, and transmitted as the only way of Worship from age to age.

32. Which Melancthon was manifestly far from, for it is his whole business in that common place to fit Ministers and Christians for Prayer, by instructing them in the Nature, Parts, Matter, Method of it, giving them Copies of Forms to imitate, largely giving them the sense of every Petition in the Lords Prayer. This (as I said at first) confirms to me, that tho Luther made a Mistake at first for the Reformed Churches in Saxony, yet it was left at liberty (nor did other Reformed Divines so well like it when it was first made, as all to write after his Copy.) Yet I will not be too confident of it. But Melancthon speaketh of no Forms which the Church proposed and willed to be used both publicly and privately, but the Lords Prayer.

R

33. Now

33. Now I should have done with the *Vindicator*, but that I remember p. 152, 153, he heavily complained, *that I took but a slishy notice of his weighy Evidence for proof of Forms of Prayer in the times of Constantine*, for which he quoteth *Eusebius de Vita Constantini*, Cap. 17, 19, 20. He shall complain no more, I will be at the pains to transcribe all the 3 Chapters, and to leave it to the Reader to judge what he can make out of them, for the *Vindicators* purpose.

“But you may see much more noble
“things then these, If you consider how

“he ordered his Court, like
Eusebius de Vi- “unto a Church. Himself
ta Constantini “when the rest were assem-
Cap. 17. “bled beginning, He took the

“Books into his hands, and
“either applyed his mind to *Meditate*
“on the Scriptures, or prayed *ἐυχαι*
“ἐν δόξῃ, with the whole Church.

“He diligently also taught his whole Ar-
“my to reverence the day

Ibid cap. 19. “which we call the *Suns day*,
“or the *Day of Light*. For

“those in his Army who were Christi-
“ans, he gave them a free liberty to
“go to Church and to pray without let.
“For the others, who were no Christi-
“ans, he ordered they should be drawn
“out into the fields, in the Suburbs,
“and there one calling them together
“by a sign, they should all use the same
“Prayer,

"Prayer ; for he said, they ought not
 "to use their Spears, and to place all
 "their hope in their Arms, and in their
 "own Strength, but spreading out
 "their hands, and lifting up their hearts
 "to the King of Heaven, they ought
 "to render him Prayers ordained,
 "and thereby recognize him who is
 "the God of the World, as the Au-
 "thor of all good things, and even of
 "Victories themselves, and by Pray-
 "er to implore him, who bestoweth
 "Victories on us, who is our Preser-
 "ver, Keeper, and Helper ; and him-
 "self commanded a short Form of
 "Prayer to be by them used in the La-
 "tine Tongue.

"We acknowledge thee O God alone, and
 "own thee as our King and we
 Ibid cap. "invoke thee as our Helper : By
 20. "thee we have gained Victories ;
 "By thee we have overcome our Enemies ;
 "we confess that by thee we have obtained
 "our present good Estate, and hope to ob-
 "tain future happiness. We all beseech and
 "begg of thee to preserve our Emperor
 "Constantine with his Pious Children
 "in Health, and as a Conqueror. -----
 "He generally (saith Eusebius) made
 "such Edicts, and commanded his Soul-
 "diers to pray in such like words.

34. Mr. Falkner in his *Libertas Eccles.* had
 brought this as a *Weighty Proof*, to prove
 the general use and imposition of *Forms of*

33. Now I should have done with the *Vindicator*, but that I remember p. 152, 153, he heavily complained, *that I took but a sliſhtry notice of his weightry Evidence for proof of Forms of Prayer in the times of Conſtantine*, for which he quoteth *Eusebius de Vita Conſtantini*, Cap. 17, 19, 20. He ſhall complain no more, I will be at the pains to tranſcribe all the 3 Chapters, and to leave it to the Reader to judge what he can make out of them, for the *Vindicators* purpoſe.

“But you may ſee much more noble

“things then theſe, If you conſider how

“he ordered his *Court*, like

Eusebius de Vi- “unto a *Church*. Himſelf

ta Conſtantini “when the reſt were aſſem-

Cap. 17. “bled beginning, He took the

“*Books* into his hands, and

“either applied his mind to *Meditate*

“on the *Scriptures*, or prayed *ἐυχὰς*

“*ἐν δόξῃ*, with the whole *Church*.

“He diligently alſo taught his whole *Ar-*

“my to reverence the day

Ibid cap: 19. “which we call the *Suns day*,

“or the *Day of Light*. For

“ thoſe in his *Army* who were *Chriſti-*

“ans, he gave them a free liberty to

“go to *Church* and to pray without let.

“For the others, who were no *Chriſti-*

“ans, he ordered they ſhould be drawn

“out into the fields, in the *Suburbs*,

“and there one calling them together

“by a ſign, they ſhould all uſe the ſame

“*Prayer*,

"Prayer ; for he said, they ought not
 "to use their Spears, and to place all
 "their hope in their Arms, and in their
 "own Strength, but spreading out
 "their hands, and lifting up their hearts
 "to the King of Heaven, they ought
 "to render him Prayers ordained,
 "and thereby recognize him who is
 "the God of the World, as the Au-
 "thor of all good things, and even of
 "Victories themselves, and by Pray-
 "er to implore him, who bestoweth
 "Victories on us, who is our Preser-
 "ver, Keeper, and Helper ; and him-
 "self commanded a short Form of
 "Prayer to be by them used in the La-
 "tine Tongue.

"We acknowledge thee O God alone, and
 "own thee as our King and we
 Ibid cap. "invoke thee as our Helper : By
 20. "thee we have gained Victories ;
 "By thee we have overcome our Enemies ;
 "we confess that by thee we have obtained
 "our present good Estate, and hope to ob-
 "tain future happiness. We all beseech and
 "beg of thee to preserve our Emperor
 "Constantine with his Pious Children
 "in Health, and as a Conqueror. -----
 "He generally (saith Eusebius) made
 "such Edicts, and commanded his Soul-
 "diers to pray in such like words.

34. Mr. Falkner in his *Libertas Eccles.* had
 brought this as a *Weighty Proof*, to prove
 the general use and imposition of Forms of

Prayer, as he doth here p. 152. I have replied shortly to it in my *Reasonable Account* p. 67, and more largely in my *Supplement* to it, p. 22. The sum of what I said was, *That this was a good Argument to prove that at that time there were no Stated Forms in the Church, for then Constantine needed not to have made any.* In my *Supplement* I repeated this, and further added, *That had there been Stated Forms, the Chaplains of his Regiments surely would have used them, and thought it piacular to use others; (as ours do now.)* 2. That these Prayers were not by Constantine made for his *Christian Ministers* but for his *Pagan Souldiers*, who couldnot be presumed to have an Ability fitly to express their *Wants* to God in Prayer. So that this was nothing to our purpose, which only is about the *lawfulness of the use of Forms made by other Men for those Ministers who have an Ability fitly to express their Minds to God in Prayer.* To instance thus, is perfectly ἐξοχίζεν.

35. I must confess I did not look into Eusebius to examine this *Quotation*, partly because I had him not in Greek, partly because both Helvicus and Alstedius and others assure us Eusebius was an *Arrian Bishop*, and so no very fit man to give us a good account of the practice of the sound part of the *Christian Church.* Alsted saith St. Hierome saith he was the very *Principal and Standard bearer of the Arrians* 3. Because he is noted by Dr. Rivet and others, as a most
Hyper-

Hyperbolical Flatterer of Constantine, who tho he was an Excellent Emperor, yet had his great Errors. 4. Because I know his story is by sober men concluded to be full of Fables, and not wrote till 300 years after Christ and upward. 5. And Principally, because his design in that Chapter is not to shew us what Prayers the Church used, but how Constantine was as to his Domestick Devotion. Now men use to be very careless of words they use, that do not strictly relate to the thing they have in hand: Eusebius his design was to tell us how Constantine behaved himself in his Chappel, joining with the Church in Prayers; not to tell us whether the Ministers Prayed by Forms or no. But considering that Eusebius lived in the time of Constantine, some may cry him up for a pretty competent Witness in matter of Fact, and so we will allow him, as to what he design'd to speak to, VIZ. That the Emperor was very devout in his Chappel, spending all his time (when there) either in private Meditations, and Reading the Scriptures, or injoyning with the Church when Praying.

36. Eusebius saith, That when Constantine was abroad with his Army, part of which were Christians, part Heathens; He was wont on the Lords-days to give order the Christians should go to the Publick Congregations of Christians: For the Heathens (who could not be admitted there) he himself made a Prayer (of which cap. 20. is a Copy) and ordered those Souldiers by

beat of Drum or sound of Trumpet or some such (probably Military) sign, to be call'd together, and one to read the Prayer to them, which Constantine had made for them who were not able to pray for themselves. What is this to the purpose?

This (as *Eusebius* saith) was admirably done, and no more then we do for our Children, or Neighbours (who have not Ability to pray without a Form) and allow to be done for any such who in the present State of any Church are to be allowed as Ministers, tho they are deficient in Ministerial Gifts. Only one Question cometh in to my mind. Suppose there were Publick Forms then used in the Churches thereabouts: Was there a Collect for Constantines success in his Wars at that time, or in general, and a proportionable thanksgiving yea or no? If not, then surely Forms are not so comprehensive as Prayers in a Publick Service of God should be. If there were any such Collect, why doth Constantine make another and not take that? It is a great Presumption that in that age there were none, and Ministers being left to their Abilities to pray in the Christian Congregations, there was great reason Constantine should otherwise provide for those that might not come in the Christian Assemblies. Let the Vindicator take which rine of the Fork he pleaseth, it killeth, instead of helping him in the case of Set Forms.

37. For what *Eusebius* saith cap. 17. That Constantine

stantine ordered his Court like unto a Church, neither will that help. For if Constantine made the Prayers which were there used, it is what we plead for ; That Ministers may mak' their own Prayers. If the meaning be no more, than that he kept λειτουργίας τῶν εὐχῶν, a Ministry or Order of Prayer, this proves nothing for Forms, for a Ministry of Prayer might have been as well without Forms as with them. The upshot of this Weighty Evidence is, here is not in it one Title of pretended Proof for the matter in Question, unless it be in the word ἐνδίκαιον. Now if that can be evinced to signifie nothing but Ordained by Publick Authority, it will prove what none denies, That the Church in obedience to Gods command had ordered Publick Prayers to be offered up to him, but not that it had ordained τύποι τῶν εὐχῶν, Forms of Prayer: for Prayers and Forms of Prayer are not convertible terms sure. Besides, I have before proved, that there is no evidence that at this time, (which was betwixt 306 and 335) there were any Forms of Prayer constituted, either by any Imperial Law, or by any General Council, or by any Provincial Council. The first Provincial Council that did any such thing, was that of Milevū, more then 60 years after this: that supposed one of Carthage was above 30 years after: That of Laodicea (pretended) 30 years after: the General Council of Chalcedon more then 200 years after. Justinians Imperial Law 200 years after. So that if any in Constantines time

ordered any, it was *himself for his Family*, which is nothing to our purpose, admitting it were true; for we will allow any master of a Family or any Minister apprehending that he or others are not able, fitly to express their own, or others wants and desires to God in Prayer, to compose a Form or Forms for themselves or others to be used, by him or them until they shall have attained to such an Ability. God forbid persons should not pray as well as they can, because they at present cannot pray so perfectly as they ought to do and to strive after.

Nor can I possibly understand by what Authority, our *Vindicator* interpreteth *ἐν δόξῃ* : Prayers which had received Authoritative Sanction, as he doth p. 152, and unless it be necessarily to be so translated, the Weight of this Weighty Evidence he speaks of n. 18, is not above the Weight of a feather: Every body knows that *ἐν δόξῃ* is but a compound of *ἐν* and *δόξῃ*, and can signifie no more then *lawful or within a Law*, and so all the *Lexicographers* (which indeed are but 3 or 4) which I have, translate it. They make *ἐν δόξῃ*, & *ἐν δόξῃ*, all to be *Synonymous*. Only they seem a little to differ in the *Etymology* of *ἐν δόξῃ* some making *ἐν δόξῃ* to be equipollent to *νόμοι τοῦ θεοῦ*, laws given: others, to *θεῖοι νόμοι* *Divine Laws*. Any Child that looks into *Scapula* will find that he expounds the word of any Laws whether they were wrote in *Mens Hearts*, or in
Tables

Tables, or confirmed by Custom, that Plutarch in *Romulus* hath *θεῖαι ἰστίαι*, Sacred Laws, and *Xenophon* *θεῖα δαίμων* : *θεῖαι δαίμων*; Divine Laws, and *Hesychius* again and again expounds *θεῖαι* by *θεῖαι νόμοι* : Divine Laws (and all know *Hesychius* is no invaluable Author for giving the true sense of Greek words.) *Constantine* ordered his Court like a Church; he had in it, constant Reading of the Scripture and Prayers: Himself was present at the Worship of his Family; and being there he spent his time either in Reading the Scripture or Praying as God had appointed. What is all this to prove that Forms of Prayer were used or appointed? This is the utmost of this *Weighty Evidence*, which surely would not have been called so, had not the *Vindicator* suspected all his Evidence to be very light.

39. The Case is now tryed, I will but sum up the Evidence, and leave the judgment to the whole *Intelligent World* as the Jury. The Question is,

Whether the Nonconformists have not probable Arguments on their side to induce them to judge, that the Church of God for six hundred years after Christ, never by their general Practice of its Ministers, nor any general Impositions upon its Ministers, judged it lawful for all Ministers, ordinarily to perform their Ministerial Acts in Publick Solemn Prayer, by the Prescribed Forms of other Men, nor directed in Ho-

ly

ly *Writ.* They think they have ;
the *Vindicator* thinks the contrary.
The Evidence on the Nonconformists
side is this,

Within the first 200 years after Christ. 1.
They find no Forms left them by Christ or the
Apostles (the Lords Prayer only excepted,
if that were so intended to be used after
Christs Resurrection :) But on the contrary
they find that *Justin Martyr* saith that in the
Christian Assemblies the Minister prayed
ὁν δέωμεν, which they translate, [as he was
able:] The *Vindicator*, [with all his might.]
They are sure it is truly translated so. The
Vindicator is not Infallible, asserting it must
be translated *with all his might*. The Non-
conf. also have *Tertullian* telling them that in
those days, they prayed *without a Monitor* ;
because from their hearts. The *Vindicator*
saith, without a Monitor cannot be *without*
a Form, because a Monitor is a person : They
conceive those that make Forms are Per-
sons, and that mute things are very ordina-
rily called Monitors, doing the things
which persons that are Monitors do. The
Vindicator thinks he hath some advantage
from *Ignatius* and *Justine Martyr*, telling
us the Christians made *κωινὰ δέωμεν* and *κωινὰ*
ῥωμεν, the Non-conformists say, The Supplica-
tions and Petitions are common in a Congre-
gation when the People make use of the
words of one that ministreth, whether,
he speaketh from a Form or no.

In the next 200 Years, The Vindicator tells

us

us. That he finds in Cyprian, *Lift up your Hearts, We lift them up to the Lord.* That Origen speaks of *Prayers Ordained*, and quotes an usual expression in their Prayers ——— *Almighty God give us a part with thy Prophets*, and that they sang by *Set Hymns*; the Non-con. answer, That this will no more prove the Ministers Prayed by Forms, then it will prove that we do so; who ordinarily begin our Prayers, with, *Let us Pray, Let us lift up our Hearts to the Lord*; and usually in our Prayer, say, *Lord forgive us our Sins*, and use several such general Petitions constantly. They say it is impossible without *Forms* of *Psalms* or *Hymns* for any *Congregation* to Sing, but they ought to keep only to *Scriptural Forms* left us on Sacred Record for that purpose.

From the Year 300 to 400. the *Vindicators* proof is from *Liturgies* pretended to be made by *Basil* and *Chrysostome*, from the Councils of *Laodicea* and *Carthage*. The Non-con. say, That *Basil* and *Chrysostomes* making *Forms*, prove nothing unless it can be proved they were by them imposed, or used by all Ministers. 2. That very learned Men have denied the *Liturgies* going under their names to be theirs; and the *Vindicator* himself will grant, That the *Liturgies* we have, could not be theirs. only he thinks they made some, tho much hath been foisted into them since, which is impossible to be proved, the corruptions come to us on the same credit, the whole comes.

comes. The *Non-conformists* prove that the Council of *Laodicea* onely ordered *Prayers* not *Forms of Prayer* to be *Morning* and *Evening*: Either there was no such Council of *Carthage* in this age, or they made no such Canon, saith *Justellus*, nor is it brought into the Code of the *Universal Church*, so could concern one Province only; nor doth the Canon establish *Forms of Prayer*. The *Vindicator* saith, *Constantine* in this age made a Prayer for his *Pagan Souldiers*, who were not able to Pray for themselves, nor might joyn with Christian Congregations. And that he Prayed in his Family. The *Non-conformists* say, They allow those may use *Forms* to guide their *Mental Prayers*, who cannot Pray *Vocally*, therefore *Constantine* did well to make a Form for such; and tho *Eusebius* saith *Constantine* in his Family Prayed, yet it cannot be proved it was by *Forms* not of *Divine Institution*. *Prayers* were appointed, but not *Forms of Prayer*. He quotes a speech of *Sozomen* relating to this Century, and a Phrase of *Nazianzen* which he maketh expository of *Sozomen* or *Julian* but the *Non-conformists* say, *Nazianzen* was dead many years before that *Sozomen* wrote, and so could not expound his words.

From the year 400 to the year 500. He quotes the general Council of *Chalcedon* 451, confirming the Canon of *Laodicea* 364; but the *Nonconf.* say that the Canon of the Council of *Laodicea* (as appears by the words) ordered not *Forms of Prayer*, only a *Publick*

lick Ministry of Prayers Morning and Night. He quotes *Proclus* also, asserting Liturgies delivered by *James* and *Clement*, *Basil* and *Chrysostome*. The *Nonconformists* say the *Vindicator* himself rejects the Authority of *Proclus*, for *St. James* and *Clement*, and they may as well do it as to the other; and that the pretended Writings of *Proclus* are of no Authority. On the contrary the *Nonconformists* say, That in this *Century* *Sozomen* saith there were no two Churches to be found which spake the same words in Prayer.

From the year 500 to 600, he quotes *Justinians Novellæ* confirming the *Canons*, of *Chalcedon*: But the *Nonconformists* say, They have proved that *Council* established no Forms. He quoted indeed before this the *Council of Milevis*, but the *Nonconformists* say, It was a particular case of a particular Province infected notoriously with *Pelagianism*, nor was that *Canon* by the *Council of Chalcedon 451*, taken into the Code.

After the year 600, the *Noncon.* wil agree that *Gregory* by his *Canon Law* established *Forms of Prayer*, as far as his Authority went, but with so bad success that if *Adrian* the Pope 200 years after had not obtained of *Charles the Great* to protect his Canon by a *Civil Sanction*, and by an horrible Persecution to inforce it, it had never obtained amongst Christians. But they say at this time the true Christians were fled into *France*, the *Vallies of Piedmont*, *Alsacia*, and *Bohemia*, where we read not that their

their Ministers generally prayed by Forms.

Now upon this Evidence, let all the *Consciencious* and *Intelligent World* judge and bring in their *Verdict* as they please, whether this Question can be determined against us by any valuable Practice of the Church in the purer primitive times, and whether Our *Reasons* be not much more valuable to prove the *Unlawfulness*, Viz.

1. Because we that are Ministers cannot do it, without omitting a mean God hath given us for the Action, and using one under no special divine Prescription.

2. Because in doing it we cannot pray with the *like Attention* and *Intention* of heart and Fervent affections.

3. Because we judge words an Essential part of *Vocal prayer*, and these or these words an *Essential part* of this or that *Vocal Prayer*.

4. Because in an Act or Part of Worship, where God hath left a liberty to Ministers or Christians, other Men cannot determine them.

5. Because in doing it we must grant a principle improveable to the total Suppression of Ministerial Gifts.

6. Because the Holy Spirit hath or may have, an influence on our words as well in Prayer, as in Preaching, or Confession; and it ought not to be shut out unnecessarily.

7. Because we cannot understand why
the

the precepts for Prayer, should be interpreted differently from the Precept for Preaching, which was never by the Church expounded. ——— Go read another Mans Forms.

8. Because it transforms Ministers, from *Ministers of Christ*, to *meer Ministers of Men*.

9. Because it makes the highest performances of Ministers, to be such as ordinary people may do, so as there were no need of such an order of persons.

10. Because by Experience we see, That many idolize *Forms of Prayer*, and think there is no other right Praying to God; which is an horrid Error not fit for us to give the least countenance to.

This is the Summ of all. Let the *Reader*, read and judge, and we trust, he will be so candid as to think we have something to say for our Dissent in this Cause.

The Conclusion.

IT is now *Reader* high time to have done drawing this *Saw* which will goe no further. I remember in the Ancient Practice of the *Canon Law*, after the *Pars Rea* or (as we call him) the *Defendant*, had put in his Answer to the Promoters *Libel*, so as there was *Lis contestata* (as we call it Issue joined) the *Promoter* or his *Proctor* took an Oath which they called *Furamentum Calumnie*, and expressed in these terms:

Ilud

*Illud juretur, quod lis tibi justa videtur.
 Et si quaeretur verum, non inficietur.
 Nil promittetur, nec falsa probatio detur
 Ut lis tradetur, dilatio nulla petetur.*

That is the Promoter was to swear, That he believed he had just cause of action. That being asked he would not deny the truth, That he would promise no Bribe, nor bring in any false Testimony, nor without just cause delay any proceedings. I have observed likewise some Writers of late interposing some Solemn Professions and Protestations; amongst others our Vindicator saith thus, p. 21.

"I do freely profess, that besides what
 "concerns the Laws of the Church and of
 "the Realm, that I account my self to have
 "as plain Evidence from the Laws of God
 "and the Constitution of the Christian
 "Church, that Schism and Unnecessary Separation, is a sin in the breach of Christian
 "Unity, as that Adultery is a sin, in the
 "breach of Wedlock. And I account my
 "self to be as certain that if ever there
 "were, an unwarrantable Separation from
 "any known Church since the Apostles
 "time, the separation from the Church of
 "England is such, since our Church is truly
 "as free from any just exception in its Constitution, Doctrine, and Worship, as any
 "other since that time, either was or is. ---
 A very large Assertion.

I shall only in like manner enter my Protestation.

1. That

1. That I do believe all unnecessary Separation from any Church of which we are, or have been Members, is Sinful.

2. I am equally certain, That Separation is necessary, where Ministers or People cannot keep communion without sin, or so far forth, as they cannot do this.

3. I have the same certainty, That the practical judgment of Ministers or Peoples Consciences, must (as to their practice) determine what is lawful and unlawful; tho it be a fallible judgment; and they are therefore bound to use the best means they can for information, before they form it.

4. I do in like sincerity profess, That I have wilfully omitted no means of a true Information, as to the Will of God in this Cause, and I do truly believe it is not lawful for me as a Minister of Christ ordinarily to perform my Ministerial Acts in Publick Solemn Prayer by the prescribed Forms of other Men, nor Divinely Inspired; nor yet, being Solemnly set apart to the Ministry, wholly to forbear Preaching.

5. There are many other things which I cannot but judge sinful, without the doing of which I can have no station in the National Ministry. Reordination, Assent, and Consent, Ceremonies, Promiscuous Administration of the Lords Supper, &c.

6. I do believe the Vindicator hath not given a just Answer to one Argument I brought in this cause, and I profess my Arguments remain still such as I cannot Answer.

7. I do finally profess, That I have not

wilfully brought any thing in any of my discourses on this Argument (laying any stress upon it) which I have not believed to be true: Nor have I been bribed, with any hopes of Reward, or Preferment. Nor have I quoted any Author (to my knowledge) falsely, or partially, hardly three which I have not seen with my own Eyes, unless I have told the Reader otherwise: Nor have I done any thing to keep my Reader from a true understanding of the thing in Question, nor gone about to blind him with Digressions, Prejudices, or Impertinent Observations, nor (further then the Nature of the matter doth it) have I loaded my Adversary with *Odium*, *Envy*, or *Prejudice*.

Whence all may observe, what need we have for to exercise a further *Charity* then is yet to be found amongst us, and a greater liberty in *Religious Worship* then we are yet so happy to enjoy; and that without it we are never like to come to our desired *Peace* and *Unity*. If there were only this single point in difference, *East* and *West* seem to me as likely to unite as *Dissenters*, and those of our *Vindicators* perswasion. The good Lord shew us a more likely way for *Union*, then all *Ministers* using the same *Words* and *Syllables* in the Acts of their Publick Worship; which is a kind of Union, *no where required*, *no where promised*, *no where found*, nor ever to be expected, and of which there is no necessity at all,

Postscript.

BEcause our Vindicator is so mightily confident, that if ever there was a Sinful Separation in the World, the Dissenters, altho they agree in the Doctrine of the Church of England (and possibly more heartily, then some others who profess only to subscribe the 39 Articles in their own sense, and as Instruments of Peace) and in the same Acts of Worship, and do not condemn the Church or Churches of England as no Churches, are guilty, notwithstanding of such a Sinful Separation. I shall crave leave to mind him of an Argument to the contrary brought this last Commencement at Cambridge (I suppose the Vindicator might hear it) which the Auditors did not judge they heard sufficiently answered by the Dr. Respondent. It was this.

To Separate (or withdraw rather) from a "Church which doth not acknowledge the true Ministers of Christ as such: is no Sinful Separation. But to separate from the Church of England is to separate from a Church that disowns the true Ministers of Christ to be such. Ergo.

The Minor was proved because it will not own Ministers ordained by meer Presbyters to be true Ministers, and so consequently disowneth the Ministry of all Forraign Churches, which by several Acts of Parliament (3 at least, one 13 Eliz. another made in the Parl. 1660, and the late Act for Uniformity) are acknowledged true Ministers. The true answer, That it is in a case of necessity (those Churches having no
Bishop

Bishops to ordain Ministers) is pitiful, for no case of necessity can make one to be that which by the Law of Christ he is not; nor was there any necessity that our Parliaments should so own them in three Acts. We had Bishops in England which could have re-ordained Ministers in 13 Eliz. and in the year 1660, and 1662.

The Basis of this Argument is also much larger. It is this:

It is lawful to withdraw from any Church, where any Ordinance of Christ, proper and necessary for any Church, is disowned, or not to be enjoyed according to the Practice of that Church.

Now whether the choice of their own Ministers and the exclusion of the ignorant and scandalous from the Lords Supper, And a power in a Church to purge it self from Ministers who by their lives, or Doctrine, make it appear, that God never called them to the Ministry, and from Members that by the Laws of Christ are to be shut out of the Communion of a Church, be not Institutions of Christ, necessary to the very being of a Church, most certainly to its well being, let any judge, and that those charged with Separation can enjoy them in the Parochial Churches of England, lies upon our Vindicator to prove, and should have been well thought on, before he had been so very positive in his charge, there being especially so many men of unquestionable Learning and Piety that are of another mind in the Case and as well assured of the contrary.

F I N I S.



An Advertisement to the Reader.

WHat thou hast here in answer to Dr. Faulkner, hath been more than *nine Months* in the *Book-sellers* or *Printers* hand, and is at last come out with more *Errata's*, then are consistent with the *Authors* reputation; some of the principal of them I shall give thee an account of, and for mistakes of a *letter* or a *stop*, leave my self to thy Charity. Only that I may not again be so smartly reflected on, for my want of skill, in the *Chronology* of *Gregory* the great, I must give thee notice, that whereas in the *Title* to the *Introduction*, the *Vindicator* is said to have asserted that *Gregory* died *15 years* before (according to *Platina*) he entred his *Popedome*, and in the *Book*, p. 14, there is only mention of *ten*: it is none of the *Authors* mistake. For in the *Edition* of *Platina* in Fol. thou wilt find he entred his *Popedome* *Anno* 1610, which was but 6 years after the *Vindicator* saith he died: but in the late *Edition* of *Platina* in 24, he is said to have entred it 1619, which was 15 years after. The Author hath left thee a latitude to believe which thou wilt, only with thy Pen correct these following *Errata's*, some whereof might be mine, in writing, but the most the *Printers*.

P. 2. l. 13. and so in many other places, for *Liturgy*, r. *Leiturgy*; l. 19. r. *ἐὐχῶν*; p. 3. l. 17. r. *deliver*; p. 7. l. 7. r. *Arguments*; l. 8. r. *with him*; l. 23. r. *self have*; p. 10. l. 5. r. *dicendum ne*; l. 13. r. & *frustra*; l. 19. r. *we judge*; l. 28, 29. r. *sæpe etiam olitor est opportuna locutus*; p. 12. l. 22. r. 604; p. 13. l. 29. r. 1000; p. 15. l. 21. r. *self say*; p. 18. l. 5. r. *Darapti Ferison*; p. 24. l. 7. r. *ἐὰν ἀρχῇ*; p. 28. l. 8. r. *gust*; l. 20. r. *an Author*; p. 35. l. 25. so p. 139. l. 17. r. *word-bate*; p. 40. l. 30. r. *no other*; p. 41. l. 32. r. *may be*; p. 57. l. 16. r. *For Ministry*, he; p. 76. l. 3. r. *αὐτῶν*; p. 116. l. 13. r. *whether it or yt*; p. 118. l. 15. r. *by which*; p. 21. l. 22. r. *who joyn*; p. 140. l. 15. r. *sometimes very little*; then blot out these words [and where they concern it, very little or nothing at all.] p. 143. l. 15. r. *when he pleaseth*; l. 30. r. *gifts*; p. 145. l. 17. r. *he be able*; p. 146. l. 22. r. *in inadvised*; p. 185. l. 4. r. *prefer*; p. 195. l. 17. r. *I may*; p. 219. l. 16. r. *Θεὸς ἀναμάρτητος*; p. 224. l. 28. r. *τῶν*; p. 225. l. 24. before *proper* r. *as*; p. 238. l. 5. r. *prayer*; p. 239. l. 29. for *others* r. *them*.